

BY
ALEXANDER SPERBER
Jewish Theological Seminary of America

NEW YORK

1943

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
PRESS OF THE JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY
PHILADELPHIA, PENNA.

To the memory of my brother

Jacobi Sperber נ"ע

(h. Dec. 30, 1890 – d. Oct. 23, 1918)

Dozent at the Rabbiner-Seminar in Berlin

להאי שופרא דבלי בעפרא קא בכינא

PROBLEMS OF THE MASORA

ALEXANDER SPERBER, Jewish Theological Seminary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. INTRODUCTION

- i. The Masoretic Bible
- ii. A New Approach

B. THE MASORETIC ACTIVITIES

- iii. The Problem of קרי and כתיב: 1. The Talmudic Statement; 2. Identification of the Examples of the Talmud; 3. The Solution of the Problem; 4. The Solution Tested on Parallel Historic Narratives; 5. The Hebrew Bible in Two Recensions; 6. The Examples of the Talmud Re-interpreted.
- iv. The Problem of מלאים וחסרים: 7. The Talmudic Statement; 8. Rashi and Tosaphot.
- v. The Problems of כולו דקדוקי ספרי: 9. The Division into Verses; 10. The Division into Sections; 11. The Extraordinary Points; 12. The Final Letters.
- vi. The Evidence of the Oldest Hebrew Bible Ms. on Record.

C. THE MASORA PARVA (מסרה קטנה) EXAMINED IN THE SOURCES

- vii. The Codex Petropolitanus: § 1. The Masora Originates in Masoretic Lists; § 2. The Text Contradicts the Masoretic Note; § 3. The Text was Revised so as to Conform with the Masora; § 4. The Masora Based Upon Different Sources; § 5. The Terminology; § 6. The Terms קרי and לא קרי; § 7. Each Masoretic Source has קרי-Readings of its Own; § 8. Readings of the Text Termed קרי.

- viii. The Ms. No. B19A of the Public Library in Leningrad: § 9. Errors are Not Considered; § 10. The Masora Originates in Masoretic Lists; § 11. The Text Contradicts the Masora; § 12. The Terminology.
- ix. The Biblia Rabbinica, Venice 1524/5: § 13. Printer's Mistakes Not Considered; § 14. The Masora Originates in Masoretic Lists; § 15. Rabbinic Sources Utilized; § 16. The Text Contradicts the Masora; § 17. The Terminology.

D. JACOB BEN CHAYIM AS EDITOR

- x. The Masoretic Text is Eclectically Established: § 18. Authorities Quoted for Doubtful Readings; § 19. The Masoretic Tradition at Variance; § 20. Masora and Text-Tradition at Variance; § 21. The Text is Made to Conform with the Masora; § 22. The Selecting of a Reading in the Absence of Masora.

E. CONCLUSIONS

- xi. How To Edit the Bible: § 23. The Problem; § 24. The Basic Bible Text; § 25. The Significance of these Specimens; § 26. Towards a New Bible Edition. 3 Plates.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES

EXPLANATION OF ABBREVIATIONS USED:

- BHKK = *Biblia Hebraica* edidit R. Kittel; Textum masoreticum curavit P. Kahle. Stuttgart 1937.
- Ven = Biblia Rabbinica; second edition; Venice 1524/5. With "Bible" or "our Bible" we refer to this edition.
- TRL = A. Sperber: Hebrew based upon Greek and Latin Translations, *IUCA*, XII–XIII.
- HPT = A. Sperber: Hebrew based upon Biblical Passages in Parallel Transmission, *IUCA*, XIV.

NTS = A. Sperber: New Testament and Septuagint, *JBL* 1940.

HPh = A. Sperber, Hebrew Phonology, *IJUCA* XVI.

K = כתיב; Q = קרי.

|| = separates the two components of a doublet.

ABBREVIATIONS IN THE MASORA QUOTED HERE:

מצע = מצעות	אב = אלפא ביתא
נבי = נביאים	אור = אוריתא
נמס = נמסר	אמצ = אמצע
נס = נסיב	אספ = אתנח סוף פסוק
ס = סוף; ספר	ביני = ביניהון
סא = ספר אחד (or: אחר)	במב = בר מן ב (two=)
ספ = סוף פסוק	בר = בראשית רבה
ספ = ספרא	בתר = בתריה; בתראה; בתרין
סת = ספר תורה	דסמ = דסמיכין
פס = פסוקא; פסוקין	זק = זקף
פת = פתח; פתחין	חס = חסר
ק = קרינן	טע = טעותא; טעמא
קד = קדמאה	יס = יש ספרים
קמ = קמץ; קמצין	כת = כתיב
קרי = קריא; קרינן	ככ = כתיב כן
רפ = ריש פסוקא	ל = לית
רפ = רפה	לק = לא קרי
תור = תורה	ליש = לישנא; לישני
תיב = תיבותא	מל = מלא
תני = תניינא	מלי = מלין
תרג = תרגום	מסה = מסורה הגדולה

A dotted letter (e. g. ב or ה) indicates: that the word referred to occurs either so many times (twice, or five times), or is spelled in such a way (with ב or ה).

A. INTRODUCTION

I. THE MASORETIC BIBLE

THE first quarter of the sixteenth century or — to be more exact — the decade from 1515 to 1525 witnessed the publication of two almost equally elaborate editions of the entire Hebrew Bible by one and the same publishing house: Daniel Bomberg in Venice put out the so-called Rabbinic Bible in its first edition in the years 1515/17, and a comparatively short time afterwards, in 1524/5, the second edition. All subsequent Bible editions up to our own days were based — or at least claimed to be — cf. my "Hebrew Phonology," (*IJUCA* XVI) §7 — upon the second *Biblia Rabbinica*, while the first edition survived merely in well equipped museums and in first class libraries. The reason for the different fates that befell Bomberg's two Bible editions lies in the fact that the second edition was *essentially* different from the first and was published with the express claim of representing the only reliable and trustworthy text of the Hebrew Bible, namely the Masoretic Text.

By the strange workings of fate, Bomberg had met, after the publication of his first Bible edition, Jacob ben Chayim, had given him a job as proof-reader in his printing plant, and was finally persuaded by him (though Jacob ben Chayim in his *Introduction* puts it to the effect that it was Bomberg, who took the initiative) — quoting Jacob ben Chayim verbatim — להדפיס כל באופן זה שיהיה עם פירושים ותרגום. ומסרה גדולה וקטנה. וקריין ולא כתבן. וכתבן ולא קריין. ומלאים וחסרים. וכולהו דקדוקי ספרי. ובתר הכי המסרה הגדולה כדרך הערוך. למען ירוץ קורא (see Jacob ben Chayim's *Introduction* towards the beginning. There the text has וקריין וכתבן, which

we corrected into **וּקְרִיין וְלֹא כַתְּבֵן**, cf. the parallel **וְכַתְּבֵן וְלֹא קְרִיין** and the later references to this point in the *Introduction*; cf. also the statement in Ned. 37b, to be quoted and discussed shortly, which corroborates our emendation).

This brief outline contains the basic features of the new Bible edition; they were meant to raise its standard from the level of *a* Bible edition to the authority of *the* Bible edition, i. e. the Masoretic Bible. These characteristics are: (1) the inclusion of the **מַסְרָה** in its two forms, as **מַסְרָה גְּדוּלָּה** and **מַסְרָה קְטָנָה**; (2) marginal notes indicating **וּקְרִיין וְלֹא כַתְּבֵן** and **וְלֹא קְרִיין**; (3) exactness in the use of the *matres lectionis*, expressed by the terms **מַלְאִים** and **חֲסָרִים**; and (4) **כּוֹלְהוּ דְּקְדוּקָי** **סְפָרִי**. I purposely retained here the original terminology of Jacob ben Chayim, without even attempting to translate or paraphrase it. For any such procedure would subconsciously prejudice us to connect a certain and historically established meaning with each term. We, on the other hand, aim at a new and unbiased investigation of the original meaning of these ancient terms.

In discussing, in his *Introduction*, the importance of these features for the establishment of a correct Bible text, Jacob ben Chayim does not follow the order in which he first listed them. While postponing the enumeration of the many and variegated difficulties in editing the **מַסְרָה גְּדוּלָּה וְקְטָנָה** till the very end, he loses no time in taking up the discussion of the terms concerning **קְרִי וְכַתִּיב** (number 2 in the list above), in order to clarify their origin and meaning. To this end he first deals with the various theories advanced by scholars of preceding generations, demonstrating their weak points and inadequacies. On the ruins of these shattered theories he then "solves" the problem, not by formulating a new theory of his own, but by plainly denying us the right to apply our reason and judgment to its solution: **כָּל אֱלֹהֵי הַתְּרוּצִים (הַשֵּׁר דִּין יִצְחָק אֲבִרְבְּנָאֵל הֵם מַסְבְּרָה.**

ואנן לית לן כי אם תלמודא דילן. אשר קבלנו עלינו. כי לבן של ראשונים כפתחו של אולם. והם אמת ודבריהם אמת. Instead of arguing, Jacob ben Chayim thus merely refers us to the statement in Ned. 37b, where these terms together with references to other Masoretic activities are classed as הלכה למשה מסיני. Now, whatever הלכה למשה מסיני may mean, one thing is surely implied herein: no human argument can prevail against it!

This way of proving his point no doubt fully appealed to Jacob ben Chayim's contemporaries, and even to later generations. Yet one cannot but wonder how Christian D. Ginsburg could base his *Introduction to the Masoretico-critical edition of the Hebrew Bible* which appeared in the year 1897, on Jacob ben Chayim's *Introduction*, without even as much as attempting to analyze critically Jacob ben Chayim's presentation of the problems connected with the Masora, and asking whether arguments, which sounded quite convincing in the early sixteenth century, still hold true in our days of historical-critical approach.

II. A NEW APPROACH

In taking up now the discussion of the problems of the Masora in the same order in which Jacob ben Chayim refers to them, we wish to emphasize, at the very beginning, that we concern ourselves solely with the problems as such and the possibility of their solution, but not with the history of dealing with these problems. To such an extent is the very starting point of all previous researches in this field outdated and obsolete, and to such an extent have the ancient arguments used as proofs pro and con for the respective theories lost their weight and power in our own age that, interesting though their study may be to the historian, they have nothing to offer to the philologist. We, therefore, turn instead right to *the sources and concentrate on*

their interpretation, with our view unobstructed by the débris of decayed theories which were based upon late Masoretic compilations.

B. THE MASORETIC ACTIVITIES

III. THE PROBLEM OF קרי AND כתיב

1. *The Talmudic Statement*

The first reference to the terms קרי and כתיב can be found in Ned. 37b, a statement which has been referred to already by Jacob ben Chayim. It reads: **אמר רב יצחק מקרא סופרים ועיטור סופרים. וקריין ולא כתיבן. וכתיבן ולא קריין. הלכה למשה מסיני**. The statement continues by giving examples for each one of the categories mentioned. We postpone the examples for the terms **מקרא סופרים** and **עיטור סופרים** for a later discussion, and proceed to **קריין ולא כתיבן: פרת דבלכתו. איש דכאשר ישאל איש בדבר האלהים. באים דנבנתה. לה דפליטה. את דהגד הגד. אלי דהגרן. אלי דהשערים. אלין קריין ולא כתבן. וכתבן ולא קריין: נא דיסלח. זאת דהמצוה. ידרך דהדורך. חמש דפאת נגב. אם דכי**. Thus the Talmud explains the term **קריין ולא כתיבן** by pointing out the following examples: (1) **פרת** in connection with the verb **בלכתו**; (2) **איש** in the verse **כאשר ישאל איש**; (3) **באים** in connection with **נבנתה**; (4) **לה** in connection with **פליטה**; (5) **את** in connection with **הגד הגד**; (6) **אלי** in connection with **הגרן**; and (7) **אלי** in connection with **השערים**. These words represent cases of **קריין ולא כתבן**. As to the counterpart of this term, namely the term **כתבן ולא קריין**, the Talmud again offers the explanation by way of listing examples. They are the instances of: (1) **נא** in connection with **יסלח**; (2) **זאת** in connection with **המצוה**; (3) **ידרך** in connection with **הדורך**; (4) **חמש** in connection with **פאת נגב**; and (5) **כי** in connection with **גואל**.

2. Identification of the Examples of the Talmud

In commenting upon this Talmudic statement, רבנו ניסים re-marks s. v. **את דהגד הגד: ברות. ויען בעז ויאמר לה הגד הגד לי** **את אשר עשית את חמותך. האי את קרי ולא כתיב. מיהו בספרים שלנו קרי וכתיב. ואף במסרה לא מדכר ליה בהנך דקריין ולא כתיב**. He identifies the example **את דהגד הגד** (cf. above #5 in the list of the **קריין ולא כתיב**) with Ruth 2.11, but voices his amazement at the fact that the Talmud considers the **את** here as **קרי ולא כתיב**, while his Bible copy exhibited it as just as regular a word of the text (**קרי** and **כתיב** identical) as any other word. We on our part are puzzled, too; for in our Bible text **את** does not occur here at all, neither as **קרי** nor as **כתיב**.

On **כתבן ולא** (cf. above #2 in the list of the **זאת דהמצוה**), Rashi remarks: **כתיב בירמיה**. But רבנו ניסים under the same heading says: **כך מצאתי כתוב. ולא נמצא**. Rashi's indication that this passage is to be found in Jeremia, is rather vague; and R. Nissim's remark is even by far less satisfactory: he saw a note giving the weekly portion **ואתחנן** (Deut. 3.23-7.11) as the location of this passage, but could not locate it there himself.

The oldest Hebrew Bible manuscript in existence, which exhibits a reference to the terms now under discussion, is the Codex Petropolitanus (written in 916/7 C. E.). In practically identical Masoretic notes on Jer. 39.12 and Ezek. 48.16 it states: **חד מן ח מלין דכתבין ולא קריין. וסימנך: אם במקום. אם אמנון. אם כאשר. אם גאל. נא יי. את אשר. ידרך הדרך. חמש דנגב**. We see that here the five examples of the Talmud have increased in number and become eight. But, to our dismay, we notice that, of the five original examples of the Talmud, only four (nos. 1, 3, 4 and 5 of our list above) survived and were incorporated in this Masoretic note; **זאת דהמצוה** (above #2) has been displaced by **את אשר**; and three more new items make

their appearance, which offer the word **אם** as a common feature (**אם כאשר** and **אם אמנון**, **אם במקום**).

The discrepancy in the number and choice of instances between the Talmudic statement and the Masoretic note in the Codex Petropolitanus might be explained by assuming that either source intended merely to exemplify the term, but did not aim at presenting us with a complete list of such cases. Of course, the fact that the Codex Petropolitanus explicitly limits the number of cases to eight seems to exclude such an explanation. But an even more startling fact remains unaccounted for: that of the 12 instances mentioned in the Talmud, R. Nissim already found himself unable to locate two. This reflects in a strange way on the attention which post-Talmudic Jewry paid to a phenomenon which the Talmud itself characterized as **הלכה למשה מסיני**.

3. *The Solution of the Problem*

The identification of the remaining ten Talmudic instances could easily be ascertained with the help of a concordance. So e. g. **קריין ולא כתיבן** (cf. above #1 in the list of the **פרת דבלכתו**) was identified as referring to 2 Sam. 8.3, where our Bible text reads: **בָּלְכְתוּ לְהַשִּׁיב יָדוֹ בְּנֶהֱרָ**; a Masoretic note here informs us that the open space with the vowel-signs **ָ** **ִ** is reserved for the word **פרת**, which is **קרי ולא כתיב**. We thus have **פרת** in connection with the verb **בלכתו**, as the Talmud stipulates it. Simple and convincing though this identification sounds, we have grave objections against it: The Talmudic assertion is centuries older than the Masoretic note on 2 Sam. 8.3 and than the invention of the vowel-signs. In Talmudic days there were no **ָ** **ִ** to keep the space open for the oral insertion of an unwritten word, and also no Masoretic note to instruct the reader what word to insert. Hence, vocalization and Masoretic note

must not be brought up as arguments in our search for the locating of the passage **פרת דבלכתו**.

The historic events as narrated in 2 Sam. 8 are once again retold in 1 Chron. 18. With the differences in the choice of words, the morphology and syntax between these two narratives of identical events I have dealt exhaustively in a monograph "Hebrew based upon Biblical Passages in Parallel Transmission," *HUCA* XIV. We now compare the *consonantal text* of verse three in these sources: 2 Sam. 8.3 reads: **בְּלָכְתוֹ לְהַשִּׁיב יָדוֹ בְּנָהָר**; 1 Chron. 18.3 reads: **בְּלָכְתוֹ לְהַצִּיב יָדוֹ בְּנָהָר פָּרָת**. (On the variant **לְהַשִּׁיב** — **לְהַצִּיב** cf. HPT §9). And now let us interpret the Talmudic statement on the basis of this parallel passage: The Talmud states that **פרת דבלכתו** is **קרי ולא כתיב**; actually we find that **פרת** in connection with the verb **בלכתו** is offered by Chron., but not by Sam. We may formulate our findings by way of an equation: According to the Bible, **פרת** in connection with **בלכתו** is offered in Chron., but not in Sam.; according to the Talmud, **פרת** in connection with **בלכתו** is offered in **קרי**, but not in **כתיב**. The conclusion is: *Chron. represents the קרי-text, and Sam. the כתיב-text*. And while stating that **פרת דבלכתו** is **קרי ולא כתיב**, the Talmud meant to indicate: in connection with the verb **בלכתו**, Chronicles has the noun **פרת**, while Samuel does not have it. The Biblical passage 2 Sam. 8.3 would, therefore, have to be read as: **בלכתו להשיב ידו בנהר** (and not vocalized **בְּנָהָר**). The noun **הַנָּהָר** (with the article) instead of **פָּרָת**, is often used to describe the Euphrates; cf. Ex. 23.31: **וְשָׁתִי אֶת גְּבֻלַּי מִיַּם-סוּף וְעַד-יָם פְּלִשְׁתִּים וּמִמֶּדְבָּר עַד-הַנָּהָר**; Num. 22.5: **וַיִּשְׁלַח מֶלֶאכִים אֶל-בְּלָעַם פְּתוּרָה אֲשֶׁר עַל-הַנָּהָר**; Deut. 11.24: **מִן-הַנָּהָר הַזֶּה וְעַד-הַיָּאֵר**; cf. similarly the use of **הַיָּאֵר** for the Nile.

Formulating our findings on a broader basis, we now state: The history of the kingdom of Judah is told twice in our Bible: in the Former Prophets (from 1 Sam. 31 on) and in Chronicles (from 1 Chron. 10 on). We disregard as later additions the

paraphrases and interpolations of the original strictly historic narrative, which occupies approximately 470 verses in more or less identical form (cf. HPT) in each of these parallel sources. The Talmud — or the ancient source whence the Talmud derived its information — designated with כתיב *that recension of historic narrative, which is now included in the Former Prophets*, while קרי *was applied to the other recension, which Chronicles now exhibits*. The problem as to whether the Talmud has the terms כתיב and קרי from his ancient source, or whether they already represent a confusion of a later generation, when the original meaning of the genuine symbols had been forgotten and was subsequently replaced by a later popular explanation (cf. similarly תא: originally for תרגום ארמי, later explained as: תרגום אנקלוס; or תי: originally meaning: תרגום ירושלמי, later misunderstood as: תרגום יונתן) is irrelevant for our investigation. On the connotation which these terms כתיב and קרי carry in the mediaeval Masoretic terminology, cf. §§ 6–8, 12c and 17c in Chapter C.

4. The Solution Tested on Parallel Historic Narratives

a) SAMUEL, KINGS, AND CHRONICLES. If our contention be correct that the historic *Annales* in the recension of the Former Prophets are meant by כתיב, and in that of Chronicles by קרי, then we should be able to verify it on more examples than just the one of פרת דבלכתו, which the Talmud mentions. Theoretically reasoning we would say: whenever a Masoretic note appears on a word in a verse of the Former Prophets, which belongs to these *Annales* (that means: the Bible offers this verse twice; in the Former Prophets and in the respective parallel passage in Chronicles), stating that the spelling of the text represents the כתיב, while the קרי has it differently, we should expect the parallel passage in Chronicles to offer this word in exactly the

same way as the Masoretic note stipulates for the קרי. This theoretical demand is fully corroborated by the facts. In order to prove this highly essential point I shall list all the passages in the *Annales* (as defined above) which have Masoretic notes regarding the כתיב and קרי, with constant reference to the textual reading of the parallel passage. The material is derived from both Bible editions, the *Biblia Hebraica* ed. Kittel-Kahle and Jacob ben Chayim's second edition of the *Biblia Rabbinica*. As a rule they agree in their application of the terms כתיב and קרי, so that I do not have to bring their sigla. Only when such a Masoretic note has but one of these Bible editions as a basis, do I put its symbol to indicate the source. I consistently vocalize the קרי-word:

- 2 Sam. 5.2: K מוציא
Q המוציא = 1 Chron. 11.2
- 2 Sam. 5.2: K והמבי
Q והמביא = 1 Chron. 11.2
- 2 Sam. 5.24: K בשמער
Q בשמערך = 1 Chron. 14.15
- 2 Sam. 8.3 as compared with 1 Chron. 18.3, cf. above p. 302.
- 2 Sam. 21.21: K שמעי
Q (Ven) שמעא = 1 Chron. 20.7; the Q (BHKK) is: שמעה; cf. HPT § 38b.
- 2 Sam. 23.8: K אחד
Q אחת = 1 Chron. 11.11
- 2 Sam. 23.9: K ואחרו
Q ואחריו = 1 Chron. 11.12
- 2 Sam. 23.9: K דדי
Q דדו = 1 Chron. 11.12; the spelling in Chron. is plene (דודו), cf. HPT § 40.

- 2 Sam. 23.9: K גברים
Q הגברים = 1 Chron. 11.12
- 2 Sam. 23.13: K שלשים
Q שלשה = 1 Chron. 11.15; the spelling in Chron. is plene (שלושה), cf. HPT § 40.
- 2 Sam. 23.15, 16, 20: K מבאר
Q (Ven) מבר = 1 Chron. 11.17, 18, 22; the spelling in Chron. is plene (מבור), cf. HPT § 40.
- 2 Sam. 23.18: K השלשי
Q השלשה = 1 Chron. 11.20; the spelling in Chron. is plene (השלושה), cf. HPT § 40.
- 2 Sam. 23.20: K חי
Q חיל = 1 Chron. 11.22
- 2 Sam. 23.20: K האריה
Q הארי = 1 Chron. 11.22
- 2 Sam. 23.21: K אשר
Q איש = 1 Chron. 11.23
- 2 Sam. 23.37: K נשאי
Q נשא = 1 Chron. 11.39
- 2 Sam. 24.14: K רחמו
Q רחמי = 1 Chron. 21.13
- 2 Sam. 24.22: K בעינו
Q בעיני = 1 Chron. 21.23
- 1 Ki. 7.23: K וקוה
Q וקו = 2 Chron. 4.2
- 1 Ki. 8.26: K דברך
Q דברך = 2 Chron. 6.17
- 1 Ki. 8.48: K בנית
Q (BHKK) בנתי = 2 Chron. 6.38; the Masoretic note in Ven: יב חס' בסוף תיבו וקרי' shows that בנית ק' is a misprint for בנתי ק', too. (cf. later IX § 13).

- 1 Ki. 9.9: K וישתחו
Q וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ = 2 Chron. 7.22
- 1 Ki. 9.18: K תמר
Q תִּדְמַר = 2 Chron. 8.4
- 1 Ki. 10.5: K משרתו
Q מִשְׁרָתִי = 2 Chron. 9.4
- 1¹ Ki. 12.3: K ויבאו
Q (BHKK) וַיָּבֹא = 2 Chron. 10.3
- 1 Ki. 12.7: K וידבר
Q וַיְדַבְּרוּ = 2 Chron. 10.7
- 1 Ki. 12.12: K ויבו
Q וַיָּבֹא = 2 Chron. 10.12
- 1 Ki. 12.21: K ויבאו
Q וַיָּבֹא = 2 Chron. 11.1
- 1 Ki. 14.25: K שושק
Q שִׁישֶׁק = 2 Chron. 12.2
- 1 Ki. 22.13: K דבריך
Q דְּבָרְךָ = 2 Chron. 18.12
- 2 Ki. 8.17: K שנה
Q שָׁנִים = 2 Chron. 21.5
- 2 Ki. 11.1: K וראתה
Q רָאָתָהּ = 2 Chron. 22.10
- 2 Ki. 11.2: K הממותחים
Q הַמוֹמְתִים = 2 Chron. 22.11
- 2 Ki. 11.4, 10, 15: K המאיות
Q הַמְּאוֹת = 2 Chron. 23.1, 9, 14
- 2 Ki. 11.18: K מזבחחו
Q מִזְבְּחִי = 2 Chron. 23.17
- 2 Ki. 14.2: K יהועדין
Q יְהוֹעָדָן = 2 Chron. 25.1
- 2 Ki. 14.12: K לאהלו
Q לְאַהֲלֵי = 2 Chron. 25.22

vice-versa: 1 Chron. 14.1: K חִירָם = 2 Sam. 5.11

Q חוֹרָם; thus, the reading of the parallel passage in the Former Prophets is termed here כְּתִיב in Chron.

The only exceptions are the following three instances, in which Chronicles exhibits textual readings which are termed כְּתִיב in the Former Prophets:

2 Sam. 10.9: K בִּישָׁרְאֵל = 1 Chron. 19.10

Q יִשְׁרָאֵל

2 Sam. 23.35: K חָצְרוֹ = 1 Chron. 11.37

Q חָצְרִי

2 Ki. 22.5: K בְּבֵית = 2 Chron. 34.10

Q בֵּית

These cases may be taken as an indication of the fact that the form in which the original *Annales* appear in the Hebrew Bible, represents an already mixed type. This explanation is further substantiated by a few cases, in which the Masoretic note concerning כְּתִיב and קרי occurs in the Chronicles passage, while it is the corresponding parallel verse in the Former Prophets, which exhibits the קרי-reading as its text:

1 Chron. 11.20: K וְלֹא

Q וְלֹא = 2 Sam. 23.18

1 Chron. 14.10: K פְּלִשְׁתִּים

Q (BHKK) תִּים (= פְּלִשְׁתִּים) = 2 Sam. 5.19

1 Chron. 18.10: K לְשֹׂאֵל

Q (BHKK) לְשֹׂאֵל = 2 Sam. 8.10

2 Chron. 18.8: K מִיכָהוּ

Q מִיכָהוּ = 1 Ki. 22.8

2 Chron. 18.33: K יָדִיךָ

Q (BHKK) יָדְךָ = 1 Ki. 22.34

2 Chron. 25.17: K לָךְ

Q (BHKK) לָכָה = 2 Ki. 14.8

2 Chron. 26.21: K **החפשות**

Q **הַחֲפָשִׁית** = 2 Ki. 15.5

b) 2 KI. 18–20 AND ISA. 36–39. The incidents told in 2 Ki. 18.13, 17–37; 19.1–37; 20.1–6, 9, 11b–19 are narrated again in Isa. 36.1–22; 37.1–38; 38.1–8; 39.1–8. In 2 Chron. 32 we have merely a short abstract of these narratives which can in no way be considered as a parallel to the reports of 2 Ki. We find ourselves thus confronted with a new problem: what place does the narrative in Isa. occupy in comparison with that of 2 Ki.? An examination of the relation of this text to the Masoretic notes on 2 Ki. concerning **כתיב** and **קרי** will furnish us with a clue towards the solution of this problem:

2 Ki. 19.23: K **ברכב**

Q **בָּרַב** = Isa. 37.24

2 Ki. 19.23: K **קצה**

Q (Ven) **קָצוּ** = Isa. 37.24

2 Ki. 19.31: K vacant

Q **צָבָאוֹת (קרי ולא כתיב)** = Isa. 37.32

2 Ki. 19.37: K vacant

Q **בְּנֵי (קרי ולא כתיב)** = Isa. 37.38

2 Ki. 20.18: K **יקח**

Q **יָקַח** = Isa. 39.7

There is only one instance, in which Isa. offers a Masoretic note of **כתיב** and **קרי**; and here the parallel in 2 Ki. has the **קרי**-reading:

Isa. 37.30: K **ואכול**

Q **וְאָכְלוּ** = 2 Ki. 19.29

I would not lay too much stress on the evidence of this instance, I feel by no means sure that this Masoretic note is based upon sound tradition. For it is quite possible that we have here rather a confusion of the sources similar to the case of 2 Ki.

20.13 and its parallel Isa. 39.2, where BHKK and Ven differ as to where the Masoretic note rightly belongs:

BHKK: Isa. 39.2: K נכתה

Q נכתו; but 2 Ki. 20.13 merely

נכתה without any Masoretic note.

Ven: 2 Ki. 20.13: K נכתה

Q נכתו; but Isa. 39.2 merely

נכתה without a Masoretic note.

We may, therefore, sum up the result of our investigation by stating that *the reports in Isa. 36-39 are of the קרי type and that consequently their proper place would be within the framework of Chronicles.*

5. *The Hebrew Bible in Two Recensions*

Our investigation has led us to the realization that in the ancient source from which the Talmudic statement in Ned. 37b emanated, כתיב and קרי (or whatever form these symbols originally had) were used to indicate variants between the two recensions of historic narrative as contained in the Former Prophets (כתיב) and Chronicles (קרי). An apparent gap in the narrative of Chronicles could be filled by pointing to the chapters 36-39 in Isa.

The Masoretic notes on כתיב and קרי do in no way represent an exhaustive list of these differences between the two recensions. I refer the student of Biblical philology to my monograph "Hebrew based upon Biblical Passages in Parallel Transmission" (IIUCA XIV) for an adequate treatment of this problem: identification of the variants and their explanation by way of grouping and classification. The preceding investigation furnishes the methodical justification of my procedure there in basing it upon the three parallel sources as defined in the introductory remarks (p. 153). The fact that we possess Masoretic

notes on כתיב and קרי for all Biblical books, while the parallel passages of our Hebrew Bible are limited mainly to the narration of certain historic events, may be taken as evidence that, originally, considerably larger portions of the Bible were transmitted in two recensions, but were subsequently withdrawn in the course of redactional developments. The fate of the parallel recension of the Pentateuch makes our explanation plausible: It is not much more than two centuries since the Hebrew Pentateuch of the Samaritans was discovered and became available to scholarship. This text represents — as demonstrated in HPT — a parallel recension of our Masoretic Pentateuch, which prior to this discovery was all we had of the Pentateuch in Hebrew. In a monograph "New Testament and Septuagint" (JBL 1940) I proved that "we shall have to assume that the Samaritan Hebrew Bible originally included the entire Old Testament" (p. 246). It now becomes clear that *the three sources in two recensions, upon which HPT is based, are in reality three fragments of one and the same genuine source, consisting of major portions of the Hebrew Bible in two recensions.*

These two recensions differed from one another in very many details. These variants are dealt with in HPT; they reflect differences in the vocabulary, morphology, and syntax. According to the results obtained there, the basic sources of that monograph can be divided into two groups; the members of each group have certain linguistic or dialectic phenomena in common, as against the members of the other group. Of course, no division can claim to be correct in each and every detail, since we possess the basic texts only in a later form, which is of an already mixed type; but in general I hope to be correct. Recension A is represented by: 1) the Masoretic Pentateuch; 2) the parallel passages in Chronicles, and 3) קרי-readings. Recension B is evidenced by: 1) the Samaritan Pentateuch;

2) the parallel passages in Samuel and Kings; and 3) כתיב-readings.

In support of these results, I should now like to refer to the conclusions I arrived at in my monograph NTS with regard to the sources of the Old Testament in Greek. I could prove there the previous existence of two independent Greek Bible translations of the Septuagint-type, which in turn were based upon two different Hebrew Bibles. As far as the Pentateuch in Greek is concerned, these two different Hebrew *Vorlagen* may be identified as more or less represented by the Masoretic and Samaritan Pentateuch, respectively (cf. NTS, especially chapter XI, pp. 242 seq., and the concluding remarks of chapter XVI on p. 278 there). In other words, the Hebrew Bible — or at least very considerable portions thereof — was originally known in two recensions, which in their turn even served as bases for two respective translations into Greek.

On the *terminus ad quem*, how long these recensions continued their separate existence, and at what approximate period we might fix the time of their final merger into the one Hebrew Bible (which in certain parallel chapters still preserves the original two-recensional character), cf. NTS, chapter XVIII, p. 283 seq.

6. *The Examples of the Talmud Re-interpreted*

I am under the impression that the instances which the Talmud lists in Ned. 37b in order to explain the terms כתיב and קרי do not represent just casual variants, but were deliberately chosen so as to illustrate some of the characteristic differences between the two types or recensions of the original Hebrew Bible:

דבלכתו reflects the use of הַנְּהַר or פְּרַת for the Euphrates; cf. p. 302.

אִישׁ דְּכֹאשֶׁר יִשְׁאַל אִישׁ בְּדִבְרֵי הָאֱלֹהִים: the indefinite pronoun "one" (German: man) is expressed in Hebrew by **אִישׁ** or merely by the 3rd person of the predicative verb; cf. Ex. 10.23: **וְלֹא יוּכַל לִרְאוֹת אֶת הָאָרֶץ** with ib. verse 5: **קָמוּ אִישׁ מִתַּחְתּוֹ**. In terming this use of **אִישׁ** as **קָרִי וְלֹא כְּתִיב**, the Talmud — according to our interpretation — wishes to indicate that Recension A has it, but not Recension B. In NTS, pp. 242 seq. in conjunction with p. 278, I proved the close interconnection between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the obelus-type, and between the Masoretic Pentateuch and the asterisk-type of the Septuagint. With the results of our discussion in the preceding paragraph in mind, we may claim the asterisk-type for Recension A, and the obelus-type for Recension B. And now we can illustrate the Talmudic example under discussion by way of reference to Origen's Hexapla. We note here the following instances, which have this particular use of **אִישׁ** in common with the passage, which the Talmud quotes:

Deut. 28.54: **הָאִישׁ הָרֶךְ**: O': \times *ο ανηρ* \times *ο απαλος*;

2 Ki. 18.31: **וְשָׁחוּ אִישׁ**: O': *και πιεται* \times *ανηρ*;

Isa. 36.6: **אִישׁ יִסְמַךְ אִישׁ עָלָיו**: O': *ως αν επιστηρισθη* \times *ανηρ* \times *επ αυτην*. In these cases, **אִישׁ** signifies "someone"; its Greek equivalent *ανηρ* is quoted *sub asterisco*, which means: it was added on the evidence of a Septuagint text which was based upon a Hebrew Bible of the Recension A-type. This shows that the usage of **אִישׁ** in this meaning is typical for Recension A, in accordance with our interpretation of the Talmud.

אֶת דְּהִגְדָּה הִגְדָּה: the use of the *nota accusativi* **אֶת** to indicate the verbal object is termed **קָרִי וְלֹא כְּתִיב**. I must confess that the examples which I listed in HPT § 119 lead to the assumption of the contrary, namely that the use of **אֶת** is characteristic of Recension B (and not A). It is, therefore, perhaps significant that the example **אֶת דְּהִגְדָּה הִגְדָּה**, which the Talmud quotes, finds

no support in the reading of our Bible (cf. also רבנו ניסים's remark, quoted here on p. 300). Similarly אלי and אלי דהגרן: the use of אל with verbs of speech (with reference to קרי ולא in Ruth 3.5, and אמר ib. verse 17) is termed קרי ולא כתיב. But in HPT § 117a, c we could show it to be a characteristic feature of Recension B. Whether the Talmud erroneously listed these instances under the wrong heading, I dare not assert, though the number of examples listed under קריין ולא כתיב, seven, seems to suggest that the last two are not genuine; the preceding term עיטור סופרים and the following term כתבן ולא קריין have only five examples each. The Munich Ms. reads 'את דהשעורים' (instead of אלי דהשעורים). However, it is enough for me to have so plainly pointed to the only existing difficulty in the application of my theory.

נא דיסלח: the addition of the particle נא to stress the meaning of supplication (referring to 2 Ki. 5.18) is termed קרי ולא כתיב. In our own terminology we would call it: characteristic of Recension B (as against A); cf. HPT § 124b 5, where this one example finds further support in an additional number of similar cases listed there.

זאת דהמצוה: whether or not the article includes the meaning of a demonstrative pronoun. The reference can not be located (cf. the quotations from רשי and רבנו ניסים on p. 300), but its implication is clear: המצוה הזאת or המצוה; the choice of the noun מצוה is obviously irrelevant. The use of the demonstrative pronoun in addition to the article is termed קרי ולא כתיב, hence: typical for Recension B. Cf. HPT § 95, where I could list further evidence for this characteristic feature of Recension B.

אם דכי גואל: the use of כי אם or simply כי in the meaning "but" (with reference to Ruth 3.12) is termed קרי ולא כתיב, i. e. particular for Recension B. Cf. HPT § 124b 3 and the

notes 413 and 414 thereon, where this assertion finds further substantiation.

As to the examples of the Masoretic note in the Codex Petropolitanus, which we quoted above p. 300, they contain in addition to Ruth 3.12 (which is cited there as **אם גאל**) three more instances of this characteristic difference: **אם במקום** (2 Sam. 15.21), **אם אמנון** (2 Sam. 13.33) and **אם כאשר** (Jer. 39.12). In these cases, **אם** is preceded by **כי**.

The cases of **ידרך דהדורך** (Jer. 51.3) and **חמש דפאת נגב** (Ezek. 48.16) are merely examples for dittography; cf. HPT § 35.

Of a similar nature — exemplifying the interchangeability of certain letters — is the **כתיב** and **קרי** referred to in Sanh. 20a: **דרש רבא. מאי דכתיב: ויבא כל העם להכרות את דוד? כתיב להכרות וקרינן להברות! בתחלה להכרותו. ולבסוף להברותו.** Here the verse 2 Sam. 3.35 is expounded in a midrashic way, which is based upon the observation that the text has as **כתיב** the reading **להכרות**, and as **קרי** the word **להברות** instead. While our Bible, which goes back to Jacob ben Chayim's edition (cf. p. 296), offers **להברות** without any Masoretic note thereon, the first Rabbinic Bible, Venice 1515/7, has here as text-reading actually **להכרות** and as marginal note **להברות**. Thus, the textual basis for the statement of the Talmud is fully substantiated; for the fact that the Venice 1515/7 edition brings **להברות** merely as a marginal note, without classing it as **קרי**, can not be used as an argument against this evidence, since this edition lists the marginal notes anonymously throughout and does not use the term **קרי** in order to differentiate between them. Now, the only difference between these two readings, which the Talmud styles **כתיב** and **קרי** respectively, is the interchange between **כ** and **ב**; cf. HPT § 23. Consequently, this case reflects, like the two cases from Ned. 37b mentioned last, merely the paleographic condition of the Bible manuscripts of

those days, and is of no consequence for the solution of the problem of **כתיב** and **קרי** now under investigation.

For a similar case in the Talmud, where the explanation of a Bible verse is based on an interchange between **כ** and **ב** as compared with our Bible, cf. Ber. 7b: **רב הונא רמי: כתיב לענותו. רב הונא רמי: וכתיב לכלותו? בתחלה לענותו. ולבסוף לכלותו**. "R. Huna tried to reconcile the difference in the expression which the Bible uses with regard to the future of Israel. In 2 Sam. 7.10 it is written: 'and the children of wickedness shall not *afflict it* any more'; but in the parallel narrative 1 Chron. 17.9 the word *destroy it* is written instead. This reflects the evil intentions of these children of wickedness towards Israel: first they aim only at affliction, but finally at complete destruction of Israel." The basis of this explanation is the reading **לכלותו** in the passage 1 Chron. 17.9. But our Bible has **לבלתו** here, and thus cannot have been the *Vorlage* of the Talmud. On the interchangeability of the letters **כ** and **ב**, cf. HPT § 23.

Phonetic confusions, too, sometimes play a role in such midrashic explanations of the Talmud; cf. Sanh. 103a: **אמר רבי יוחנן משום רבי שמעון בר יוחאי. מאי דכתיב: ויתפלל אליו ויחתר לו? ויעתר לו מיבעי ליה! מלמד שעשה לו הקב"ה כמין מחתרת ברקיע.** "R. Johanan said on the authority of R. Simeon b. Johai: What is meant by: "and he prayed unto Him and an opening was made for him" (2 Chron. 33.13)? Should not "and was entreated of Him" rather have been written? — This teaches that the Holy One blessed be He made for him a kind of opening in the Heavens in order to accept him with his repentance, on account of the Attribute of Justice, which was against it." This is based on a reading **ויחתר**; but our Bible actually offers **ויעתר** which — according to the Talmud — *should* have been written there! On the interchange between **ח** and **ע** due to the similarity of their phonetic value, cf. HPT § 6.

IV. THE PROBLEM OF מלאים וחסרים

7. *The Talmudic Statement*

The uncertainty in matters of spelling Hebrew words: whether and when to apply the vowel-letters to indicate the respective vowel, finds its clear expression in Kid. 30a (cf. the parallels in Rabbinic literature in Higger's *מסכת סופרים*, chapter IX, section 2): לפיכך נקראו ראשונים סופרים. שהיו סופרים כל האותיות: (2) שבתורה. שהיו אומרים: וא"ו דנחון חציין של אותיות של ספר תורה... בעירב יוסף: וא"ו דנחון מהאי גיסא או מהאי גיסא? אמרו ליה: ליתי ספר תורה ולימניהו! מי לא אמר רבה בר בר חנה: לא זזו משם עד שהביאו ספר תורה ומנאום? אמר להון: אינהו בקיאי בחסירות ויתרות. אנן לא בקיאינן. "The early scholars were called *soferim* (cf. 1 Chron. 2.55), because they used to count all the letters of the Torah. Thus they said: The *waw* in נחון (Lev. 11.42) marks half the letters of the Torah... R. Joseph propounded: Does the *waw* in נחון belong to the first half or the second? Said the scholars to him: Let a Scroll of the Torah be brought, and we will count them! Did not Rabbah b. Bar Hanah say (on a similar occasion): They did not stir from there until a Scroll of the Torah was brought and they counted them? Answered he to the scholars: *They were thoroughly versed in the defective and plene spellings, but we are not.*"

This general statement is being corroborated by Talmudic references to the spelling of specific words. In Ket. 5a we read: השיב בבלי אחד. ורבי חייא שמו: ויבשת ידיו יצרו. ירו כתיב. "Here a Babylonian scholar interrupted the discourse (of a Palestinian colleague) and his name was R. Hiyya by referring to the verse Ps. 95.5, where God's hands are spoken of (in connection with the creation) as a plural: ידיו. He got the reply: the actual spelling of the word in question in the text is de-

fective: יָדוֹ, thus implying a singular." This statement contrasts with the *plene*-spelling in our Bible!

The Palestinian Talmud, too, contains evidence for this fact that at that early period, the spelling differed from the one which our Bible has adopted; cf. Yer. Ber. VII, 11c: מַה מְקַיִּימִין רַבֵּן טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי יוֹסִי הַגְּלִילִי? בְּמַקְהָלוֹת. בְּכָל קַהִּילָה וְקַהִּילָה. "How will the Rabbis explain the argument of R. Josse ha-Gelili? The answer is: The plural בְּמַקְהָלוֹת (Ps. 68.27) has collective meaning, embracing the multitude of single communities. To this R. Hanina the son of R. Abahu replied: Your supposition is wrong, because the word is spelled *defective* as בְּמַקְהֶלֶת (thus implying a singular)." But our Bible has the word in *plene* spelling!

The controversy in the Talmud, whether יֵשׁ אִם לְמַקְרָא or יֵשׁ אִם לְמַסְרָת: whether we are guided in our conclusions by the pronunciation (מַקְרָא) or the spelling (מַסְרָת) of a given word in the Bible, sheds light on our problem, too; cf. Sanh. 4a: רַבִּי וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה בֶּן רוּעֵץ וּבֵית שְׁמַאי וְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן וְרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא. כּוֹלֵהוּ סְבִירָא לֵהוּ: יֵשׁ אִם לְמַקְרָא . . . בֵּית שְׁמַאי דַּתְנִן . . . וְאִמְרַר רַב הוֹנָא: מַאי טַעְמָא דְבֵית שְׁמַאי? קַרְנוֹת. קַרְנוֹת. קַרְנוֹת. הֲרִי כֹאן שֵׁשׁ . . . וּבֵית רַבִּי וְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה בֶּן רוּעֵץ, the Shammaites, R. Simeon and R. Akiba, all hold that the pronunciation of the word is determinant in Biblical exposition . . . R. Huna said: What basis in the Bible text have the Shammaites for their opinion? The answer is: The word קַרְנוֹת, meaning horns of the altar, occurs three times in the context (Lev. 4.25, 30, 34) and, being pronounced *karnoth*, as a plural, each occurrence implies two sprinklings; that makes six altogether . . . But the Hillelites argue from the way the word in question is spelled: twice *defective*, implying only one sprinkling each, and once *plene*; this makes four sprinklings altogether." This reference to the spelling of the word is in open

contrast with our Bible, where all three occurrences appear in *defective* spelling.

Similarly we read in Sanh. 4b: **וְדָכוּלִי עֲלֵמָא יִשְׁאֵם לְמִקְרָא? וְהִתְנִיָּא: לְטַטְפַּת. לְטַטְפַּת. לְטוּטְפוֹת. הָרִי כֹאן אַרְבַּע. דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעְאֵל**. "But do all, indeed, regard the pronunciation of the word as determinant? Has it not been taught: The word for "frontlets" occurs three times in the Torah, twice in *defective* spelling, implying only one section each, and once *plene*, thus indicating altogether the four sections, into which the phylacteries are to be divided." The word occurs Ex. 13.16; Deut. 6.8 and Deut. 11.18. The controversy here refers to the spelling of the ending of the word: whether *plene* וַח, thus necessitating us to see in it a plural-form, or *defective* ח, classing it as a singular. Against this statement of R. Ismael cf. our Bible, where the word is spelled in all three instances with a *defective* ending ח.

8. Rashi and Tosaphot

In the Talmudic statement quoted last, R. Ismael does not explain which of the three occurrences of **לְטַטְפַּת** is spelled *plene*, and which *defective*. In commenting upon this passage, Rashi identifies them by saying: **בְּפֶרֶשֶׁת שְׁמַע וּבְפֶרֶשֶׁת כִּי יִבְיֹאךְ כְּתִיב לְטַטְפַּת חֶסֶר וַי"ו. אֲבָל בְּפֶרֶשֶׁת וְהָיָה אִם שְׁמוֹעַ כְּתִיב לְטוּטְפוֹת מֵלֵא. הָרִי כֹאן דְּבָתִּים לְחִפְלִין שֶׁל רֹאשׁ**. "In Deut. 6 and in Ex. 13 the word is spelled **לְטַטְפַּת**, *defective*, implying a singular; but in Deut. 11 that word appears *plene* as **לְטוּטְפוֹת**, thus indicating a plural. Hence we derive the law of the four divisions for the frontlet." We thus see that in this particular controversial instance, Rashi's Bible had preserved the same reading as that which we have to surmise for the Talmudic period. But already his grandson's Bible exhibited in this passage the reading of our own Bible (as against Talmud and Rashi); cf. **חֹסֶפֶת דָּה. לְטַטְפַּת לְטַטְפַּת לְטוּטְפוֹת: תִּימָא. דְּלֹא כְּתִיב וַי"ו בֵּין פ"ה לְחִי"ו**

בכולהו. "R. Ismael's conclusion is surprising, since in none of the three passages is there a *waw* between the פ and ת (to indicate the *plene* spelling of the ending)."

Even more outspoken in underlining the apparent discrepancy between Biblical quotations in the Talmud and the respective text-readings in their proper places in the Bible itself, is another marginal gloss on Shab. 55b. Here the Talmud asserts: והכתיב מעבירים? אמר רב הונא בריה דרב יהושע: מעבירם. כתיב. "But it is written (1 Sam. 2.24): 'ye (scil. plural) cause the Lord's people to transgress'? To this replied R. Huna the son of R. Joshua: It is written: 'he (singular) causes them to transgress'." The interpretation of R. Huna is based upon the spelling of the word. According to his assertion which arose no contradiction, the spelling of the ending is defective (merely ם, and not ם'), and implies that the subject is in the singular. The Tosaphot avail themselves of this opportunity of an obvious difference between the Bible text itself and the quotation in the Talmud, to point out another similar case; cf. תוספות דה. מעבירם כתיב: השם שלנו חולק על הספרים שלנו. שכתוב בהם מעבירים. וכן מצינו בירושלמי בשמשון: והוא שפט את ישראל ארבעים שנה. מלמד שהיו פלשתים יראים ממנו עשרים שנה אחר מותו כמו בחייו. ובכל הספרים שלנו כתיב: עשרים שנה. "The Talmud text disagrees with our Bible text which offers the reading מעבירים (in 1 Sam. 2.24), implying a plural. Similarly we find a discrepancy between the Palestinian Talmud text and our Bible text in the case of Samson. The Palestinian Talmud quotes Judg. 16.31 as: 'And he judged Israel forty years.' The apparent contradiction between this indication and that of Judg. 15.20, where Samson's period of rule is given as twenty years, is explained in this fashion: hence the Philistines dreaded him for twenty years after his death just as in his lifetime. But our Bible text has both in Judg. 16.31 and 15.20 equally 'twenty years'." Thus the Talmudic interpretation finds according to

the Tosaphot no basis in these readings. Though, strictly speaking, this variant, forty-twenty, does not belong in our present discussion of *plene* and *defective* spelling, I still should like to remark that though the way the Talmud quotes Judg. 16.31 is without foundation in *our* Bible, it most likely was well based in the Bible of those days. Cf. similar uncertainties of transmission concerning the numbers forty and twenty: The verses 2 Ki. 8.26 and 2 Chron. 22.2 are identical; but in 2 Ki. the age of Aḥaziah is given as: **בן-עשרים ושנים**, while in 2 Chron. it is: **בן-ארבעים ושנים**. Furthermore: according to 1 Sam. 4.18 the period of Eli's judgeship is given as: **ארבעים שנה**; but Origen *ad loc.* is quoted by Field as translating: *εικοσεν ετη*.

In the preceding discussion of Sanh. 4b, we found Tosaphot's Bible agreeing with our own text, as against the way these words were quoted in the Talmud. This does not yet mean that the Bible in the days of Tosaphot and in ours is the same. It is enough to refer to Men. 43b in order to exclude any such assumption: **תוספות דה שואל מעמך: פירש רבנו תם דהוי מלא**. "R. Tam explains this Talmudic passage by pointing out the fact that in Deut. 10.12 the word **שואל** is spelled *plene*, thus bringing the number of letters in this verse up to hundred." But our Bible has **שאל** in *defective* spelling! Had R. Tam had this our Bible before him, then he would certainly have looked for another possible explanation of this Talmudic passage.

We now return to Rashi (cf. p. 318): On Gen. 25.6 Rashi comments on **דה הפלגשם: חסר כתיב. שלא היתה אלא פלגש** **היא קטורה**. "The ending of the Hebrew term for concubines is in *defective* spelling, thus indicating a singular; for Abraham had only one concubine, Hagar and Keturah being two names for one and the same person." But in our Bible the ending is spelled *plene*: **הפלגשים**, and clearly signifies a plural.

A ritual still in common use in Israel is involved in Deut. 6.9. Here Rashi remarks on דֵּה מְזוּזוֹת בֵּיתְךָ: מְזוּזָה כְּתִיב. "The ending of the Hebrew word for 'door-posts' is spelled *defective*, implying a singular; accordingly, one *mezuzah* is enough." But our Bible exhibits מְזוּזוֹת, with a *plene* spelling of the ending; and this implies a plural!

9. The Division into Verses

The statement in Kid. 30a, parts of which we cited above on p. 316 in order to inaugurate our investigation of the problem of spelling, contains also remarks of basic importance with regard to the way of dividing the Bible text into verses. For the sake of clarity of presentation, the repetition of the introductory phrases is unavoidable: לפיכך נקראו ראשונים סופרים. שהיו סופרים כל האותיות שבתורה. שהיו אומרים: ... והתגלח וחציין של פסוקים ושל ספר תורה. ... והוא רחום יכפר עון חציו דפסוקים ושל תהלים. ... בעי רב יוסף: והתגלח מהאי גיסא "או מהאי גיסא? פסוקי ליתו למנייה! בפסוקי נמי לא בקיאינן. The early scholars were called *soferim*, because they used to count all the letters of the Torah. Thus they said: ... והתגלח (Lev.

13.33) marks half of the verses of the Torah ... **והוא רחום** ... half of the verses of the Psalms ... **יכפר עון** (Ps. 78.38) ... R. Josef propounded: Does **והתגלח** belong to the first half or the second? Said the scholars to him: For the verses at least we can bring a Scroll of the Torah and count them! But the answer was: *In the division of verses we are not certain, either.*"

In passing we wish to point out that according to a Masoretic note Lev. 8.8 is the middle verse of the Pentateuch; from Lev. 8.8 till ib. 13.33 there are 160 verses, too many to be ascribed only to faulty counting. According to **מסכת סופרים** ed. Higger, chapter IX, section 2, the middle verse begins with **וישחט**; on the location of this verse cf. Higger's note *a. l.*

The expression **לא בקיאין** "we are not certain" with regard to the division into verses in the Talmudic statement just quoted seems to imply that no fixed and generally recognized division of the text into verses was known at that period. Different schools may have followed their own respective stylistic taste in subdividing scriptural portions into verses. In Meg. 22a we have positive evidence for this explanation of ours: **רב אמר: כל פסוקא דלא פסקיה משה. אנן לא פסקין ליה.** "Rab said: . . . Any verse which Moses had not divided, we do not divide; but Samuel said: we do divide it." The reference to Moses as authority in matters of division into verses merely seeks to claim greater antiquity for a certain system of division; cf. the terming of the Masoretic activities as **הלכה למשה מסיני** in the Talmudic passage quoted here above, p. 299.

Further support for our interpretation of the implication of the expression **לא בקיאין** may be found in a statement in Kid. 30a (following the statement cited above and referred to): **כי אתא רב אחא בר אדא אמר: במערבא פסקי ליה להאי קרא לתלתא פסוקי: ויאמר ה' אל משה הנה אנכי בא אליך בעב הענן.** "When R. Aḥa b. Adda came (from Palestine to Babylon), he

said: *In the west* (scil. Palestine) *the one verse Ex. 19.9 is divided into three verses.*"

Was the verse Ex. 19.9 the only instance, in which the Palestinians differed so widely from the Babylonians on this point? Or is Ex. 19.9 merely referred to as one example (but by no means the only one!) to illustrate the immediately preceding assertion *בפסוקי נמי לא בקיאין* "in the division of verses are we not certain, either"? We are inclined to favor this second alternative, in support of which even another Talmudic statement may be cited, which follows right after the one quoted last. It reads (cf. Higger's *אוצר הברייכות*, Vol. V, p. 561, # 281): *תנו רבנן: חמשה אלפים ושמונה מאות ושמונים ושמונה פסוקים הוו פסוקי ספר תורה. יתר עליו תהלים שמונה. חסר ממנו דברי הימים שמונה.* "Our Rabbis taught: There are 5888 verses in the Torah; the Psalms exceed this number by 8, while Chronicles are less by 8." These three Biblical books were selected for a comparison in the number of their verses for an obvious reason: because they provided the Talmud with an example for a play on the number 8: we have 5888, 5888+8 and 5888-8. Hence, there can be no room for any doubt in the exactness of the tradition concerning the numbers given.

Let us now compare these numbers with the respective indications of the Masora on our Bible. In parenthesis I bring the number according to the Talmud: Pentateuch: 5845 (5888); Psalms: 2527 (5896); Chronicles: 1656 (5880). We discard the discrepancy concerning the number of the verses of the Pentateuch, since the difference is insignificant. But the proportion of the numbers as given by the Masora to those of the Talmud is for the Psalms approximately 1:2, and for Chronicles almost 1:4. This can surely not be attributed to a mistake in counting, but positively *reflects a difference in the respective system of division, with one system (Masora) favoring larger sentences (verses), while the other (Talmud) preferred short ones.*

In the light of these results we shall now be able to interpret the Tosaphot on Meg. 22a: **דה אין מתחילין בפרשה פחות משלשה פסוקים: גזירה משום הנכנסין. שלא יטעו לומר שאותו שקרא לפניו לא קרא אלא שני פסוקים. וקשה על מנהג שלנו. שאנו קורין בפרשת ויחל בתעניות. והראשון מתחיל שם. והוא לסוף שני פסוקים מפרשה שלמעלה. וכן המפטיר ביו"ט בחוה"מ דפסח. "In reading from the Torah at services we do not read less than three verses together at the beginning of a section. This is done out of apprehension that late comers might err in assuming that someone who was called up first read only two verses from the Torah. Now the difficulty arises with regard to our custom: On public fast days we read the section beginning with **ויחל** (Ex. 32.11). The first person to be called up starts there, though only two verses separate it from the preceding section. Similarly he who is called up as "*maḥṣir*" on the intermediate days of the Passover-festival begins his reading of the Torah with **והקרבתם** (Num. 28.19), and this, too, is only two verses removed from the beginning of the section." In comparing this statement with our Bible we find that Ex. 32.11 is four verses removed from the beginning of the section (Ex. 32.7), and Num. 28.19 three verses (Num. 28.16). Had Tosaphot had any knowledge of these facts, then no question **וקשה על מנהג שלנו** would have been asked, since only three verses' distance from the section are required by the law. The continuity of the narrative in these sections excludes any explanation that according to Tosaphot the sectional division of these passages must have been a different one. We thus see that the two verses, according to the division of Tosaphot, correspond to our four or three verses, respectively. This means a proportion of 1:1½ or even 1:2.**

The very same proportional difference in the methods applied in dividing the verses can be demonstrated on the basis of our Bible also, by way of internal evidence. Certain genealogic or

historic material appears twice in our Bible; but its division into verses follows different stylistic rules or taste.

1. One verse in Chron. corresponds to $1\frac{1}{2}$ verses elsewhere:

1 Chron. 1.17 = Gen. 10.22, 23b

“ 1.30 = “ 25.14, 15a

“ 1.40 = “ 36.23, 24a

“ 16.29 = Ps. 96.8, 9a

“ 17.13 = 2 Sam. 7.14a, 15

2 Chron. 13.2 = 1 Ki. 15.2, 7b

“ 24.1 = 2 Ki. 12.1, 2b

2. One verse in Chron. corresponds to two verses elsewhere:

1 Chron. 1.42 = Gen. 36.27, 28

“ 1.43 = “ 36.31, 32

“ 6.42 = Josh. 21.13, 14

“ 10.12 = 1 Sam. 31.12, 13

“ 17.1 = 2 Sam. 7.1, 2

2 Chron. 9.1 = 1 Ki. 10.1, 2

3. One third of a verse in Chron. corresponds to a full verse elsewhere:

1 Chron. 2.3c = Gen. 38.7

4. One and a half-verse in Chron. correspond to one verse elsewhere:

1 Chron. 21.11a, 12 = 2 Sam. 24.13

2 Chron. 7.8, 9b = 1 Ki. 8.65

10. The Division into Sections

While discussing the Tosaphot in Meg. 22b with regard to the division into verses, we emphasized that the continuity of the narrative in the passages referred to by Tosaphot makes it im-

possible to affirm a different sectional division as the solution of the difficulty (p. 324). We thus admitted that but for the logical interconnection of the verses under discussion, we might have questioned the correctness of the tradition concerning the sectional division in our Bible. In doing so, we would be in a position to refer to the authority of a Talmudic statement which plainly upsets the Masoretic division into sections; the resulting discrepancy becomes even more striking by the elaborate working out of the details involved in the comment of Tosaphot. We refer to Pes. 117a (cf. also Higger's *מסכת סופרים*, chapter XX, section 7, and his Introduction p. 33):

אמר רב חסדא: רבה בר רב הונא אמר: הללויה ריש פירקא. אמר רב חסדא: חזינא להו לתילי דבי רב חנין בר רב. דכתיב בהו הללויה באמצע פירקא. אלמא מספקא ליה. אמר רב חנין בר רב: הכל מודים בתהלת ה' ידבר פי ויברך כל בשר שם קדשו לעולם ועד. הללויה דבתריה ריש פירקא. רשע יראה וכעס שניו יחרק ונמס תאות רשעים תאבד. הללויה דבתריה ריש פירקא. ושעומדים בבית ה'. הללויה דבתריה ריש פירקא.

"R. Hisda said: "Hallelujah" marks the end of a chapter; Rabba b. R. Huna said: "Hallelujah" marks the beginning of a chapter. R. Hisda observed: I saw that in the copies of the Psalms used in the college of R. Hanin b. Rab, "Hallelujah" was written in the middle of a chapter, *which proves that he was in doubt*. — R. Hanin b. Rab said: All agree that in the case of Ps. 145.21, the "Hallelujah" which follows it is the beginning of the next Psalm (Ps. 146.1); in Ps. 112.10, the "Hallelujah" which follows it commences the next Psalm (Ps. 113.1); and also in the passage "Ye that stand in the house of the Lord" (Ps. 135.2), the following "Hallelujah" commences the next Psalm (Ps. 135.3)." A mere glance at our identification of the quotations of the Talmud, which we bring in parenthesis, shows that in the Psalms of the Talmud, the very same verse which forms Ps. 135.3 according to our Bible, marked the

beginning of a new Psalm. Thus, R. Hanin b. Rab's doubts as to the division of the Psalms into sections were well founded.

We now turn to Tosaphot's comment: **דה הכי גרסינן: שעומדים בבית ה' בחצרות בית אלהינו. הללויה דבתריה ריש פירקא. ולא גרסינן: העומדים בבית ה' בלילות. דאם כן הוה ליה למינקט: יברכך ה' מציון. שזהו פסוק למעלה מהללויה. ולא הוה ליה למנקט שלשה פסוקים למעלה. לכך נראה דגרסינן כדפרישית. ולפי זה אנו צריכין לומר בו: הללויה הללו את שם ה' הללו עבדי ה' שעומדים בבית ה' וגומר שלמעלה מזה אינו תחלת המזמור. דלא יתכן שיהיה המזמור שני פסוקים. ועוד דאמרינן במדרש: קמ"ז מזמורים יש בספר תהלים כנגד שנות יעקב. אלא הוא סופו של שיר המעלות הנה ברכו וגומר. ואתי שפיר דקאמרינן לקמן: רב אחא בר יעקב דמתחיל הלל הגדול מכי יעקב בחר לו יה. דהוי תחילת המזמור. דבענין אחר לא יתכן שהיה מתחיל הלל מאמצע המזמור. "The Talmud's last quotation refers to Ps. 135.2 and to the following "Hallelujah" of ib. verse 3; but not to Ps. 134.1, a verse which highly resembles our verse of Ps. 135.2. Had the Talmud thought of citing Ps. 134, it would not have quoted the verse 1 of Ps. 134, but verse 3 there; for it is this verse 3 which is immediately followed by "Hallelujah" (namely Ps. 135.1), while verse 1 of Ps. 134 is three verses ahead of the next "Hallelujah" (namely Ps. 135.1; between Ps. 134.1 and 135.1 are three verses). Hence it is evident that the Talmud had Ps. 135.2 in mind. As a result of this observation we shall say that the verses Ps. 135.1-2 which precede the "Hallelujah," are not the beginning of a Psalm, since in this case the Psalm would consist of two verses only (for "Hallelujah" in verse 3 marks already the beginning of a new Psalm), and this would be in itself an anomaly, and would in addition upset the established number of Psalms which is 147 in accordance with the life-span of the Patriarch Jacob. It thus follows that Ps. 135.1-2 form the end of Ps. 134. This also explains why R. Aḥa b. Jacob, as stated later on, began the Great Hallel with**

the verse Ps. 135.4 (since the verses 1–2 of Ps. 135 thus belong to Ps. 134, and verse 3 of this Ps. 135 is merely the introduction of the Psalm, as indicated by הללויה, the Psalm really commences with what is in our Bible verse 4 thereof). He surely would not have started the Great Hallel in the middle of a Psalm! But according to our interpretation, the “Hallelujah” in Ps. 135.3 marks the beginning of a new Psalm, of which Ps. 135.4 is the first verse.”

Again we wish to stress the importance of our indicating the location of Biblical passages in Tosaphot's quotations; by this procedure we have brought into sharp relief the divergences in the division of the Psalms according to Tosaphot as against our Bible. In addition, we desire to point out that Tosaphot's argument: no Psalm consists of two verses only, is further proof of our thesis, since in our Bible Ps. 117 has only two verses. As to the number of Psalms which the Tosaphot give (on the basis of the Midrash) as 147 — while we have 150 — I refer to A. Z. Schwarz' Catalogue of the Hebrew manuscripts of the *Nationalbibliothek* (formerly: *k. k. Hofbibliothek*) in Vienna (published in 1925): In the manuscript no. 5 (described on p. 6 of the Catalogue) the number of Psalms is 147. This number is achieved by the following deviations from the practice of our Bible: Pss. 9 and 10 form only one Psalm in this manuscript; similarly Pss. 70 and 71, Pss. 114 and 115. Ps. 113 of the manuscript corresponds to our Ps. 117–118.4 and consists thus not of two verses only (but of six verses), in accordance with the assertion of the Tosaphot: דלא יתכן שיהיה המזמור שני פסוקים.

11. *The Extraordinary Points* (נקודות)

That by putting a dot above a letter, the scribe meant to indicate that this letter was written by mistake and should, therefore, be erased, is too well known a fact to dwell on here;

cf. במדבר רבה, פרשה ג, סוף הפרשה: ויש אומרים: למה נקוד? אלא כך אמר עזרא: אם יבוא אליהו ויאמר: למה כתבת אותן? אומר לו: כבר נקדתי עליהם. ואם יאמר לי: יפה כתבת! כבר אמחוק נקודותיהם מעליהם. This passage not only explains the origin of the points as meaning *delendum*, but also gives the reason why subsequent scribes did not take the hint and leave these letters out, instead of copying them with their dots above. For, in doing so, they secured for themselves the possibility of an honorable retreat: in case later scholars were of the opinion that the letter thus stigmatized did by right belong to the word, they could still save it by deleting the point. In the language of our own period we would put the thought thus: A word with one or more letters with such points on them represents a combination of two words: one consisting of all the letters written, and another formed by the free letters only.

We shall now discuss from this our point of view the words with such dots in the same order as they are listed in **מסכת סופרים** ed. Higger, chapter VI, section 3; there the parallel Rabbinic sources are mentioned, too:

1. Gen. 16.5: **ויבין** and **ויבין**: a combination of **ויבין** and **ויבין**. The *mater lectionis* י merely indicates the vowel, but not the number (sing. or plur.) of the suffix; cf. HPT § 78.
2. Gen. 18.9: **ויאמרו אליו**; against this way of putting the points already Mueller in his edition, p. 87, suggested the order **ויאמרו אליו**, namely: **ויאמרו אליו**. This results in the readings: **ויאמרו אליו** and **ויאמר לו**; cf. HPT § 117. Note also the singular **ויאמר** in the following verse 10.
3. Gen. 19.33: **ולא ידע בשכבה ובקומה**; hence *plene* spelling **ולא ידע בשכבה ובקומה** or *defective* **ולא ידע בשכבה ובקומה**; cf. HPT § 40c.

4. Gen. 33.4: ויפל על צואריו וישקהו: a textual difference.
5. Gen. 37.12: וילכו אחיו לרעות את צאן אביהם: on the use of the *nota accusativi* את cf. HPT § 119.
6. Num. 3.39: כל פקודי הלויים אשר פקד משה ואהרן: a textual difference; cf. ib. verse 14: the command was issued to Moses alone.
7. Num. 9.10: או בדרך רחוקה; this leads to: רחוקה and (or) רחוק. The gender of דרך is given as masc. or fem.; cf. HPT § 88, especially note 289.
8. Num. 21.30: ונשים עד נפח אשר; the two readings are: אשר and אש; cf. $\pi\tau\upsilon$ in the Septuagint, and אש in the Hebrew Pentateuch of the Samaritans.
9. Num. 29.15: ועשרון עשרון; but according to the parallel Rabbinic source in במדבר רבה, the passage Num. 28.21 is meant: עשרון עשרון: "a tenth" in a distributive sense can thus be expressed either by the repetition of the term, or by the simple term: עשרון or עשרון עשרון; cf. similarly Gen. 7.2: שנים שנים with SAM.; ib. verse 16: זכר ונקבה with SAM.; Num. 4.19: איש איש with SAM.; 1 Chron. 21.3: כהם with 2 Sam. 24.3: כהם וכהם; 2 Chron. 4.18: מאד with 1 Ki. 7.47: מאד מאד.
10. Deut. 29.28: הנסתר לה אלהינו והנגלות לנו ולבנינו עד: The ע in עד leaves the ד without support; I, therefore, believe that the dot over the ע originates in a confusion of the Masoretic note עד meaning "up to" (עד עד עולם) with the text-word עד. We now get two sentences: the one as spelled above, and the other reading: הנסתר לה אלהינו והנגלות עד עולם.

12. *The Final Letters*

In Meg. 2b we read the following assertion: **ואמר רבי ירמיה ואיתימא רבי חייא בר אבא: מנצפ"ך צופים אמרו** — or you may also say: R. Ḥiyya b. Abba — also said: The alternative forms of the letters MNZPK were prescribed by the Watchmen."

This rather brief statement is found in a clearer and more elaborate form in Yer. Meg. I, 9: **כל האותיות הכפולים באל"ף בי"ת: כתב הראשונים בתחילת התיבה ובאמצע התיבה. ואת האחרונים בסופה. ואם שינה פסל. משום רבי מתיה בן חרש אמרו: מנצפ"ך הלכה למשה מסיני. . . אנשי ירושלים היו כותבין ירושלים ירושלימה. ולא היו מקפידין. ודכותה: צפון צפונה. תימן תימנה** "With regard to all the letters of the alphabet which appear in alternative forms, one writes the first forms at the beginning of a word and in the middle of a word, and the later forms at the end [of a word]. A deviation from this rule makes the Torah unfit for religious use. It is said on the authority of R. Matyah b. Heres: The alternative forms of the letters MNZPK are **הלכה למשה מסיני** . . . People of Jerusalem were in the habit of writing **ירושלים** and **ירושלימה** without differentiating; similarly: **צפון** and **תימנה** and **תימן** and **צפונה**." In quoting the text and in the translation I followed the way the words are spelled in the Krotoschin edition. The result is only too obvious: the second part of the quotation seems entirely out of place here. The statement deals with the final letters, but suddenly shifts over to what appears to be an indifference of the inhabitants of Jerusalem towards the use or omission of the ה *euphonicum* (on this new term, instead of the misleading term ה *locativum* hitherto applied, cf. HPT §§ 103-107). But we can not fail to observe that the examples chosen end either in ם or ן. We, therefore, suggest seeing in the second part of the statement the continuation of rules for the scribe concerning the final

letters, allowing for an exception of the foregoing general assertion **ואם שנה פסל**, in keeping with the custom prevalent in Jerusalem. We should like to repeat this second part, both in the original and in translation, in order to adjust the spelling of the words in question to our interpretation: **אנשי ירושלים היו כותבין ירושלים ירושלימה. ולא היו מקפידין. ודכותה: צפונ צפונה.** "People of Jerusalem were in the habit of writing **מ** and **נ**, both in medial and final position, and did not differentiate;" with the statement in this revised form cf. HPT § 37a, where additional cases are listed in which **מ** and **נ** are employed in final positions (according to the **כתיב**); cf. also the next paragraph *passim*.

VI. THE EVIDENCE OF THE OLDEST HEBREW BIBLE MS. ON RECORD

Abraham Epstein in an article "Biblische Textkritik bei den Rabbinen" (*Chwolson-Festschrift*, Berlin 1899, pp. 42 seq.), called attention to a list of variant readings of an ancient Pentateuch manuscript, the Codex Severus, as compared with the readings of the accepted text of those days. This list is contained in several manuscripts of the **בראשית רבה**, and was presented by Epstein in the article just mentioned on the basis of a comparison of all the sources which were available to him. Originally, this list must have had a wide circulation; Epstein proves that even Kimḥi quoted it. It is headed by the following introductory remarks: **אלין פסוקיא דהוו כתיבין בספר אורייתא דאשתכח ברומא. והות גנוזה וסתומה בכנישתא דסוירוס. בשינוי אותיות ותיבות.** We shall follow here the order in which Epstein lists these variants, and accept the readings which he establishes. But the interpretation which we are going to offer, will be based on the results at which we arrived in our independent researches on Biblical philology. A hyphen divides the readings

of the Codex Severus (right) from those of the Bible text then in authority (left):

Gen. 1.31: מאד (טוב) — מות; cf. TRL, paragraph XXXI 1.

“ 3.21: אור — (כתנות) עור; cf. HPT § 3.

“ 18.21: הכצעקתם — הכצעקתה; cf. HPT §32 6.

“ 25.33: מכרתו — (את) בכרתו; cf. HPT § 12; on the nominal form of the variant spelling מכירתו, cf. HPT § 70a.

Gen. 27.2: יום מותי — יום מותי; cf. HPT § 37a, and here the preceding paragraph.

Gen. 27.27: סדה — (כריח) שדה; cf. HPT § 8; cf. also Baba Batra 9a the quotation of Isa. 58.7 as: הלא פרוש (but in the Bible: פרס).
לרעב לחמך. בשי"ן כתיב

Gen. 36.5, 14: יעיש — יעוש; cf. HPT § 30.

“ 36.12: בנ עדה — בן עדה; cf. HPT § 37a, and here the preceding paragraph.

Gen. 43.15: מצרים — מצרים; cf. HPT § 108c. It is noteworthy that our Bible exhibits here מצרים. This shows that the Bible text which served as basic text for the comparison with the Codex Severus, can not be identified with our Bible.

Gen. 48.7: שמ — שם; cf. HPT § 37a, and here the preceding paragraph.

Gen. 46.8: מצרים — מצרים; cf. HPT § 108c.

Ex. 12.37: מרעמס — מרעמס; cf. HPT § 34.

Lev. 4.34: מדם — מדם; cf. HPT § 37a, and here the preceding paragraph.

Lev. 14.10: תמימים — תמימה; cf. HPT § 32 6.

Num. 4.3: הבא — (כל) בא; cf. HPT § 93b.

“ 36.1: בני יוסף — בן יוסף; cf. HPT § 34.

Deut. 1.26: אביתם — אביתם; cf. HPT § 37a, and here the preceding paragraph.

Deut. 3.20: **הם — המ**; cf. HPT § 37a, and here the preceding paragraph.

Deut. 22.6: **האבנים — הבנים**; cf. HPT § 38a.

" 32.25: **אפאיהם — אף איהם**; cf. HPT § 37.

C. THE MASORA PARVA (מסרה קטנה) EXAMINED IN THE SOURCES

VII. THE CODEX PETROPOLITANUS

§ 1. *The Masora Originates in Masoretic Lists*

It seems most plausible that the original sources of the marginal Masoretic notes (Masora parva) in our manuscript have been Masoretic compilations in the form of lists. They contained uncommon phenomena in the spelling or the pronunciation of certain Hebrew words, grouping them according to these unusual features which they exhibit:

חִי. כנמרד. היום. עוד. בספר. כעת. ולציון. יאמר. Jer. 7.32:
לעם הזה. עוד. התפת. שוע. עזובה. שנ בת.
מספר. שנ בת.

This list offers references to 14 instances only and is, therefore, incomplete; for חִי states that the word occurs 18 times. The Tiberian vowel-signs **ִּ**, **ֵ**, **ֶ** under חִי are an addition, presumably from another source, since the genuine vocalization of the Masora to this manuscript applies the Babylonian system; cf. § 5. The addition of the vocalization **ִּ**, **ֵ**, **ֶ** results in a disagreement between the list and MT; for יאמר in connection with כנמרד (Gen. 10.9), בספר (Num. 21.14), and ולציון (Ps. 87.5) is vocalized יֶאֱמַר in MT. But of by far greater importance for us here is the fact that, incomplete though this list is, it contains a reference to התפת as item number 9; and התפת refers to the very same verse, Jer. 7.32, where this note is found. The Ma-

sorete substantiated his statement ח"י by adding the catchwords of the list, the heading of which was ח"י.

The following examples are similarly excerpts of lists; we indicate the respective headings by extra spacing:

Hos. 1.2: זנה ל. אלה. נדמה. פנה. כהה. הלין דכת הי :זנה
בס מלתא וק וא.

After remarking that זנה occurs only here in this spelling, the Masoretic note mentions four more verbs of the *tertia* ה group in the absolute infinitive which are spelled with ה at the end; this ה serves as *mater lectionis* for the vowel *o* which elsewhere is indicated by *waw*.

Ezek. 40.4: ל מל. ב. את כחי: הראותך כת. הלין: הראותכה
הראותכה. והוא מן כ מלין דכת
הי בסוף תיב.

The brief note ל מל: the word does not occur any more in this *plene* spelling, is followed by an elaborate statement: Twice this verbal form occurs in the Bible: in Ex. 9.16 ending in ך, but here in כה; and this is one of the twenty words which have (in connection with כ) a ה as *mater lectionis* in final position.

Ezek. 37.22: יו ק. והוא מן יד מלין הי כת בסוף :יהיה
יו ק.

The structure of this note closely follows the pattern which we described in the preceding example: First a short remark on the word under consideration (י ק); and then an abstract of the pertinent list: this is one of the 14 cases, in which ה is written but *waw* (as *mater lectionis* for *u*) is heard in the pronunciation.

In the examples which we discussed till now, the respective Masoretic notes at least take cognizance of the somewhat peculiar spelling or pronunciation of a given word. The Masoretic lists which are quoted — in full or merely by their headings — in this connection, show further instances of the same grammatical phenomenon. But our assertion that such Masoretic lists were

the original basis of all marginal Masoretic notes will become even more convincing, when we turn to the following examples:

Isa. 48.15: מן ז מ ל ין ג ג א ת ין ב ה ון : א נ י .

This is one of the seven trilateral words (which are repeated).

Isa. 57.1: מן כ ט ה פ ס ו ק ין ד ס ו פ י ה ון כ ר י ש י ה ון : ה צ ר י ק .

There are 29 verses, in which the first and the last word are identical; this is one of them.

Isa. 10.13: א ל ק . מן מ ח ד נ ס א ב י מ צ ע ת י ב : כ א ב י ר : ו ל א ק ר .

There are in all 48 cases in which (like here) א is spelled in medial position, but not pronounced.

It seems that the Masorete had a number of Masoretic lists in front of him. He must have felt that somehow he had to dispose of them and make their contents available to those who might use the manuscript.

§ 2. *The Text Contradicts the Masoretic Note*

In many instances, where the marginal Masoretic note points to some detail of the spelling or pronunciation of the word in question, this statement is in open contradiction to the actual text of the manuscript. This proves that the compilers of the Masoretic lists, whence these notes emanate, had as *Vorlage* the Hebrew Bible in a different textual type before them, and that this fact had remained unnoticed by the author of the marginal Masora in our manuscript:

Ezek. 37.3: ל מ ל ו ב ת ר ין י ו"ד : ה ת ח י נ ה .

The Masoretic note asserts that nowhere else but here does this word occur in *plene* spelling, namely with two י. Still, the text offers a *defective* spelling, exhibiting only one י.

Jer. 27.3: **לֹא כֵת הִי וְקָ: הַמִּלֵּאכִים**.

Though the letter **ה** does not appear in the spelling, it is nevertheless heard in the pronunciation. But the text offers **ה** in the spelling, too.

Jer. 5.22: **בְּחֵם: הָאוֹתִי**.

This word occurs twice, and both times its spelling is *defective*. But our text is quite obviously *plene*.

§ 3. *The Text was Revised so as to Conform with the Masora*

Difficulties of a typographical nature make it impossible for us to reproduce in print the way how the scribal changes discussed in this paragraph are accomplished in the manuscript.

a) BY ELIMINATING A CONTRADICTING VOWEL-LETTER.

Isa. 10.16: **חֵם כֵּת: כְּבוֹדוֹ**.

The original reading **כְּבוֹדוֹ** in *plene* spelling was changed into **כְּבוֹדוֹ** by putting a circle round the first *waw*, so as to conform with the Masoretic note which states that the spelling of the word is *defective*. A circle around a letter indicates that this letter was erroneously written and, hence, should be deleted. Similar instances for this procedure are:

Isa. 10.17: **חֵם כֵּת: וְקִירוֹשׁוֹ**

Isa. 24.16: **חֵם כֵּת: זְמִירוֹת**

Jer. 32.41: **חֵם יוֹד קָד: לְהִיטִיב**

This formula indicates wherein the defectivity of the spelling consists: the first ' is missing.

Ezek. 37.7: **חֵם יוֹד קָדָם: גִּידִים**

Ezek. 13.20: **קָד וּ חֵם: מְצוֹדְרוֹת**

b) BY ADDING OR CHANGING A VOWEL-LETTER.

Jer. 44.8: **יֵא דַכַּת בִּיּוֹד : בַּמַּעֲשֶׂה**

The first hand wrote here **בַּמַּעֲשֶׂה**. The reviser found herein an open contradiction to the Masoretic note: that this word is one of the eleven occurrences in a spelling with י'. Consequently he drew a line through the ה in such a manner that a י' actually resulted above the line.

Isa. 3.2: **וּמַל : שִׁפְט**

The Masoretic note: that this passage is one of six, in which the word occurs in *plene* spelling (as **שׁוּפֹט**), has induced the reviser to add a ו in the space between the letters ש and פ. The graphic picture which the word now offers, makes it evident that the reviser accomplished his task prior to the vocalizer, since the vowel י' is added to the ו (**שִׁפְט**).

Jer. 26.6: **הָ ל ק : הַזֹּאת**

The Masoretic note remarks: the letter ה appears merely in the spelling, but not in the pronunciation of the word. The word as written down by the first hand (**הַזֹּאת**), actually has a ה in the initial position. But the reviser evidently realized that this ה, being the article, has its place in the pronunciation of the word, and therefore added a final ה. This fact here combined with our observation on the preceding example may lead to the assumption that the reviser and the vocalizer were one and the same person.

Ezek. 11.6: **וּלְמַלְאֲחֵם : וּלְק**

The reviser must have had a model codex in front of him, while going through this manuscript. For how else could he have known that the Masoretic note refers to י' as an indicator of the vowel *i* and not of the preceding vowel *e*?

§ 4. *The Masora Based Upon Different Sources*

Thus far, our examples demonstrate contradictions between the text and its marginal Masoretic notes. Consequently, the *Vorlagen* of the Masoretic notes must have been drawn up on the basis of a different textual type of the Bible. Now the question arises: Do they all spring from one and the same source, or were these *Vorlagen* merely a compilation of Masoretic material, originating in and based upon various textual types of the Bible? In other words: are the Masoretic notes consistent within themselves, and do their cross-references agree with one another, so as to corroborate the manuscript's Masoretic statements?

One example will bring clarity into this problem: The word מנחתו occurs twice in the Bible: in Isa. 11.10 and Zech. 9.1. In Isa. 11.10 the manuscript reads: בַּחֵם וּדְמֶשֶׁק: מְנוּחָתוֹ. We see that the scribe wrote the word *plene*, but the reviser eliminated the first vowel-letter ו (by inserting a circle, cf. § 3a), in accordance with the Masoretic note which says: this word occurs twice in the Bible, both times in *defective* spelling, the second instance being in connection with the noun וּדְמֶשֶׁק. This is a cross-reference to Zech. 9.1. But here the manuscript offers: מְנוּחָתוֹ: לַחֵם. According to this note, the instance here is the only one, in which the word occurs in *defective* spelling (note the contradiction between בַּחֵם and לַחֵם!). Hence, in the Bible upon which this second Masoretic note is based, the Isa.-passage must have been spelled *plene*; cf. the original of that spelling by the scribe of our manuscript as מְנוּחָתוֹ!

This internal disagreement between the *Masoretic notes* themselves proves that they do not form a unity reflecting only one Bible text with all the peculiarities of its spelling, but that they *reflect a variety of sources*.

§ 5. *The Terminology*

While discussing the instance from Jer. 7.32 (in § 1) we stated that the Tiberian vowel-signs ְ , ִ , ֵ are an addition from another source, since the basic character of the manuscript is Babylonian. In order to prove the correctness of this assertion, I wish to refer to a few cases, in which it is even more obvious that their Tiberian vowel-signs were added later, since they result in a doublet:

Isa. 44.15: $\text{בְּ קָמַ וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה}$

This note originally read: בְּ קָמַ : twice וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה is vocalized with $\text{קָמַ$. The addition of ִ under the בְּ made קָמַ superfluous; as it stands now, the note offers a doublet.

Jer. 10.8: $\text{יָבַ פֶּתַח מוֹסֵר}$

The components of this doublet are: יָבַ פֶּתַח and $\text{יָבַ$. It is noteworthy that the text has a ḵameš ; on the discrepancy between text and Masoretic note cf. § 2.

Isa. 19.20: $\text{בְּ חֵרֶן קָמַ וּרְבַּ$

A combination of בְּ חֵרֶן קָמַ and בְּ חֵרֶן .

Our regarding these Tiberian vowel-signs as later additions by no means implies that they were added to our manuscript at a later period. It is quite feasible that the Masorete of our manuscript found them already in his sources. This would lead us to the assumption that these sources already were of a mixed type. There is nothing startling in such an assumption; we even have additional proof for it in the fact that one and the same grammatical phenomenon is described in this Masora by different terms:

Isa. 3.2: $\text{וּ מַלְּ שִׁפְטַ$;

ib. 10.13: $\text{נִבְנוּתִי כַתּ: נִבְנוּתִי}$

The fact that the vowel *o* is indicated by *waw* as a *mater lectionis* is termed once: מלא, and once: כתיב.

Isa. 28.2: חס כח: ואמץ

Jer. 13.2: שים ק: ואשם

In either case the Masora dwells on the fact that the vowel *i* is spelled without a *mater lectionis*. It is quite clear that קרי here cannot mean: read (as against the spelling of the word), since there can be no doubt as to the pronunciation of ואשם, no matter whether with or without י. We do not wish to press this point, we merely argue: As a rule, the terms כתיב and קרי are used to exclude one another. Thus, חס כח: ואמץ implies: but the קרי is with י. On the other hand, שים ק: ואשם means: but the כתיב is without the י. Now, if the terminology were uniform, we would have either

חס כח: ואשם and חס כח: ואמץ; or
שים ק: ואשם and מים ק: ואמץ.

But, as it stands, these Masoretic notes reflect a different terminology, and this implies: different sources of origin.

This result is being corroborated by the doublet in

Jer. 2.9: עוד ק. || יב דכת חס: ער

This Masoretic note is a combination of עוד ק and יב דכת חס into one note. Thus, the terms קרי and כתיב, מלא and כתיב are interchangeably used here.

§ 6. The Terms קרי and לא קרי and their Equivalent in Other Masoretic Sources

a) THE TERM קרי. We have thus far realized that the Masoretic notes in our manuscript go back to different sources, and employ a different terminology for the very same phenomena. Our in-

terest is now focussed on the term קרי: Does this term possess a *unique* significance of its own, or is it merely one of the *several* possibilities of terming certain phenomena? To this end we shall compare a few passages exhibiting this term in our manuscript, with the respective Masoretic notes in BHKK and Ven, which aim at the establishing of the very identical readings. We thus base our investigation on three sources, which are independent of one another:

Isa. 3.8: ל חס: עני; cf. BHKK and Ven: עני ק

Jer. 13.2: ג חס: ואשם; cf. BHKK and Ven: ואשם ק

These examples uphold our findings at the end of the preceding paragraph that קרי and חסר are interchangeably used.

Isa. 10.33: ל כת א: פארה; cf. BHKK: פארה ק; Ven: פארה

Jer. 30.16: ל ויתיר א: שואסיך; cf. BHKK: שואסיך ק; Ven: שואסיך

Here קרי is interchangeably used with the terms (אלף) כתיב and (אלף) יתיר, respectively. Note that in the first instance it is BHKK, and in the second instance Ven, which exhibit this term; cf. also later *bβ*.

b) THE TERM לא קרי. a) Often, when the Masorete wished to indicate that a letter, though contained in the spelling of the text, should not be pronounced, he remarked on it: this letter to be לא קרי. The same result is achieved in BHKK and Ven by a somewhat different procedure: here the remaining letters of the word in question are termed קרי. The difference in the Masoretic practice consists therein that our manuscript directs the reader by לא קרי: what to omit, while in BHKK and Ven the reader is told by קרי: what to retain.

1. Jer. 4.5: ו ו לק: ותקעו; cf. BHKK and Ven: ותקעו ק
Jer. 8.1: ו ו לק: ויצאו; cf. BHKK and Ven: ויצאו ק
(in Ven both the text and the Masoretic note are spelled *plene*: ויצאו ק: ויצאו).

2. Jer. 2.33: למדתי ק; י ל ק: למדתי; cf. BHKK and Ven: למדתי ק: למדתי
 Jer. 3.4: קראת ק: קראתי; י ל ק: קראתי; cf. BHKK and Ven: קראתי ק: קראתי
 Jer. 4.30: ואת ק: ואתי; י ל ק: ואתי; cf. BHKK and Ven: ואתי ק: ואתי
3. Jer. 3.7: ותר ק: ותרעה; ה ל ק: ותרעה; cf. BHKK and Ven: ותרעה ק: ותרעה

β) With the results of our discussions in §§ 5 and 6 in mind: that קרי does not signify a term of unique importance, but is interchangeably used with such other terms as חסר and יתיר, the following instances find their explanation:

Jer. 1.5: ל ומל: אצרך ק; BHKK: אצורך; י ל ק: אצורך
 Jer. 5.7: יתיר ו: אסלח ק; Ven: אסלוח; BHKK: אסלוח; י ל ק: אסלוח

§ 7. Each Masoretic Source has קרי-Readings of its Own

a) READINGS TERMED קרי IN OUR MANUSCRIPT ONLY. On a number of passages, in which the textual reading of our manuscript agrees with that of BHKK and Ven, there is a marked disagreement in the respective Masoretic notes. The marginal Masora on our manuscript exhibits a textual variant termed קרי, but in the other sources which are made use of here for comparison (BHKK and Ven) the Masora merely emphasizes the characteristic feature of the spelling of the text, thus endowing it with additional authority, and — possibly — silently rejecting as incorrect the very קרי-reading of our manuscript:

Isa. 41.18: נ מל: שפיים; cf. BHKK and Ven: שפאים ק: שפיים

The note מלא refers to the spelling of the ending ים with two yod; in our manuscript the additional א of the קרי is *mater lectionis* for the vowel *a* in פ, cf. HPT § 38a.

Isa. 25.6: ל חס: ממחים; cf. BHKK: ממחים ק: ממחים

The term חסר (in BHKK) may indicate the absence of *waw* as *mater lectionis* for *u*, or even the spelling of the ending ים with

only one *yod*; cf. the preceding example, where י"ם is termed מלא. The note לית is — as always — an abbreviation for לית כח: the word does not occur any more in this spelling; cf. also:

Isa. 30.5: ל כח כן: הבאיש; cf. BHKK and Ven: הבאיש ק: הוביש ק

Here, too, לית כח: upholds the spelling of the word as offered in the text.

Isa. 53.4: חלינו ק: לאי ק; cf. חלינו: Ven: ל; BHKK: no note.

This example shares with the first two instances a certain tendency of the קרי-readings to make use of א as *mater lectionis* for the vowel *a*. But our manuscript is far from being consistent in this point, as the following example will show:

Jer. 40.1: באזקים: ל א ל ק; cf. BHKK and Ven: באזקים

While the note אלף לא קרי eliminates this vowel-letter from the קרי-reading of our manuscript, the לית in the other sources represents an effort to preserve it.

b) READINGS TERMED קרי IN OTHER SOURCES.

Isa. 28.15: שוט ק שיט; cf. BHKK and Ven: שוט

Isa. 47.13: הברי ק: הברו; cf. BHKK and Ven: הברי

Isa. 57.19: ניב ק: נוב; cf. BHKK and Ven: ניב

Isa. 60.21: מטעי ק: מטעו; cf. BHKK and Ven: מטעי

§ 8. Readings of the Text Termed קרי

Marginal Masoretic notes sometimes offer two different readings, terming one כח: and the other קרי. A comparison of these variants with the actual word in the text reveals it to be identical with the form termed קרי in the Masoretic note.

We arrange the material according to the parallel evidence from BHKK and Ven on the words under consideration:

a) BHKK AND VEN HAVE THE IDENTICAL TEXTUAL READING, BUT NO MASORETIC NOTE TO IT.

Isa. 18.2, 7: **חד כת ובתרין קר**: **קו קו**. The **כתיב** is as one word, but the **קרי** as two.

Isa. 22.18: **צניף כת צנוף ק**: **צנוף**

Jer. 4.30: **יך כת וך ק**: **בפוך**

Jer. 22.14: **י כת ו ק**: **וספון**

Jer. 26.24: **בני כת בן ק**: **בן**

Jer. 29.7: **הגילתי כת הגליתי ק**: **הגליתי**

b) BHKK AND VEN HAVE THE SAME MASORETIC **קרי** NOTE ON THE PRESUPPOSED **כתיב** TEXT.

Jer. 2.27: **תני כת תנו ק**: **ילדתנו**

cf. BHKK and Ven: **ילדתני**

Jer. 8.6: **רצות כת רוצת ק**: **במרוצתם**

cf. BHKK and Ven: **במרצותם**

Jer. 13.20: **אי כת או ק**: **שאו**

cf. BHKK and Ven: **שאי ק**

Jer. 13.20: **אי כת או ק**: **וראו**

cf. BHKK and Ven: **וראי ק**

Jer. 17.10: **כו כת כיו ק**: **כדרכיו**

cf. BHKK and Ven: **כדרכו ק**

Jer. 21.12: **הם כת כם ק**: **מעלליכם**

cf. BHKK and Ven: **מעלליהם**

Jer. 32.4: **נו כת ניו ק**: **עיניו**

cf. BHKK: **עיניו ק**. Ven has here **עיניו** as reading of the text; but cf. there the preceding **ועיניו ק**.

Jer. 49.30: הם כת כם ק: עליכם;

cf. BHKK and Ven: עליהם ק: עליכם

Ezek. 46.19: חם כת תים ק: בירכתים;

cf. BHKK and Ven: בירכתם ק: בירכתים

c) BHKK AND VEN OFFER THE PRESUPPOSED כתיב TEXT, WITH MASORETIC NOTES UPHOLDING THESE READINGS.

Hos. 4.6: ואמאסאך כך כת ולא ק א תלתא: ואמאסך

The word is spelled in the כתיב with three א, but the third א is omitted in the קרי; cf. ואמאסאך: BHKK: א יתיר; Ven: ל וכתו כן יתיר א. The note in Ven is a doublet; cf. later § 17c 23.

Zech. 8.20: עד כת עוד ק: עוד;

cf. BHKK: יב חס; Ven: יד חס: עד.

The same difference יב — יד occurs also in the note on עד in Hos. 12.10.

d) VARIOUS OTHER CASES

Jer. 48.21: מי כת מו ק: מופעת;

This identification of the reading with *yod* as כתיב, and that with *waw* as קרי is reversed in BHKK and Ven: מופעת ק: מופעת.

Jer. 32.19: אדם כת האדם ק: האדם

But BHKK and Ven have as text אדם, i. e. the presupposed כתיב, without any Masoretic note. Similarly in

Jer. 28.13: מוטת כת: מטות

This מוטת form is the text-reading of BHKK and Ven: מוטת: מוטת. But in

Isa. 27.6: ופ ק: יפרח;

it is the קרי form, which is the text-reading in BHKK and Ven: ופרח, with no note to it.

VIII. THE MS. # B19A OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY IN LENINGRAD
(ACCORDING TO THE BIBLIA HEBRAICA ED. KITTEL-KAHLE)

§ 9. *Errors are Not Considered*

No conclusions will be based in this study upon such discrepancies between the text and the Masora, which can best be explained as scribal (or printer's) mistakes. The human eye is not infallible!

Isa. 47.7: לְ; mistake for: לְ.

The word does not occur any more in this vocalization with ,.

Isa. 51.2: לְ; mistake for: לְ.

Isa. 53.7: בְּ; mistake for: בְּ.

Cf. ib. verse 11: בְּ. The second occurrence of בְּ is Hos. 10.6.

Ps. 136.1: כֹּ; mistake for: כֹּ.

This Psalm has only 26 verses.

Ezek. 39.9: לְ; mistake for: בְּ.

Cf. Hos. 1.7: בְּ.

§ 10. *The Masora Originates in Masoretic Lists* (cf. § 1)

Gen. 50.9: וְגַם וּמְלֵא חֲדָה בִּינִיהּ

1 Sam. 18.5: וְגַם וּבַחַר תַּלְתַּ מְלִין

Ezek. 5.13: בִּם בִּם

Judg. 12.4: בַּחֲוֹךְ בַּחֲוֹךְ

2 Sam. 19.7: כִּי כִי כִי כִי כִי; cf. the identical note on Josh. 17.18. In both instances the context excludes an error of misspelling וְכִי into כִּי.

Esth. 3.13: כֹּ פְסוּק אֵית בַּהוֹן אֶלֶף בֵּית. This is obviously the heading of a list; it has been rephrased in Isa. 5.25 and Zech. 6.11 to read: אֵית בַּפְסוּק אֶלֶף בֵּית.

Num. 7.20: בַּכּ פֶּסוּק דְּלִי בִּהּוֹן לֹא וּלֹא י': כֶּף

Lev. 13.9: יֹא פֶסוּק רֹאשׁ נוֹן וְסוֹף נוֹן: נָגַע

1 Sam. 20.29: הַ פֶּסוּק דֹּאִית בִּהּוֹן חֲמֵשׁ מִלִּין מִן בִּ אֲתִין: עַל

1 Sam. 13.19: אָמְרוּ ק'. וְ פֶסוּקִין: שְׁבַעַה מְכָה. וְשְׁבַעַה מְכָה. אָמַר:

ומציעי כח. There are 7 verses consisting of 15 words each, the middle word of which has a Masoretic note referring to כְּחִיב and קְרִי.

§ 11. The Text Contradicts the Masora

a) THE MASORETIC CROSS-REFERENCES REFLECT A DIFFERENT TEXTUAL TYPE OF THE HEBREW BIBLE

1 Sam. 18.10: יֹא: כִּיּוֹם; but Isa. 9.3: יֹא: כִּיּוֹם.

The text of BHKK offers the word כִּיּוֹם ten times only, but according to the text of Ven, it occurs eleven times; for Ezek. 30.9 which reads in BHKK: כִּיּוֹם, has כִּיּוֹם in Ven. Hence, both notes יֹא and יֹא are correct in themselves, but refer to two textual types as represented by BHKK and Ven respectively.

The following cases are to be explained in a similar way:

2 Ki. 18.31: בִּ חֵד מֶלֶךְ: בּוֹרוּ. The word occurs twice, once in *plene* spelling. But Isa. 36.16: בּוֹרוּ is *plene*, too! And the Masora remarks on it: לֶמֶל: it does no more occur מֶלֶךְ, thus presupposing that in 2 Ki. 18.31 the word is in *defective* spelling.

Neh. 7.4: בִּ חֵד מֶלֶךְ: וְגִדּוּלָה. But in the other passage, where this word occurs, namely Eccl. 9.13 it is *plene*, too: וְגִדּוּלָה.

2 Ki. 23.29: כִּרְאָתוֹ: בִּ חֵד חֶסֶד; cf. in the other passage, 2 Ki. 6.21: כִּרְאָתוֹ, which is equally חֶסֶד, and the Masoretic note there: בִּ חֶסֶד plainly states that this word is both times spelled *defective*. Similarly

Zech. 9.1: מִנְחָתוֹ: בִּ חֵד חֶסֶד; but Isa. 11.10: מִנְחָתוֹ: בִּ חֶסֶד.

Cf. our discussion of this word in connection with Codex Petropolitanus in § 4.

Ex. 19.13: ^לב ^לחד ^למל ^לוחד ^לחם : ^לסקול ; cf. the other passage referred to: Ex. 21.28: ^לסקול, equally in *plene* spelling.

Ex. 14.14: ^לב ^לחד ^למל ^לוא ^לחם : תחרישון, as compared with the *plene* spelling in Job 13.5: תחרישון.

Eccl. 11.3: ^לשיפול ; ^לב ^לחד ^למל ^לוחד ^לחם : שיפול ; but ib. 4.10 equally: ^לשיפול.

Ps. 64.5: ^ללירות ; ^לב ^לחד ^לחם : לירות ; but ib. 11.2: ^ללירות.

Ezra 9.12: ^לשלמם ; ^לב ^לחד ^לחם : שלמם ; but Deut. 23.7: ^לשלמם.

b) THE MASORA CONTRADICTS ITS OWN CATCHWORD.

Ex. 16.7: ^לתלִּינוּ : י קרי . But the text actually has a *yod*! (Cf. Lev. 13.20: ^להוא : י קרי , where the text offers a *waw*). Our Masoretic note presupposes a textual type like that of Ven; cf. there: ^לתלִּינוּ (with *waw*): ^לתלִּינוּ ק (with *yod*). Similarly reflecting the Ven textual type:

Ezra 10.44: ^לנשאו ק ; ^לנשאו ק ; cf. Ven, where the text ^לנשאי (with *yod*) has this Masoretic note: ^לנשאו ק.

Ps. 99.6: ^לאלף : ל יתיר א : קראים . The vocalization shows that the ^לאלף is not superfluous, but on the contrary belongs to the root; cf. Neh. 5.7: ^לנשאים : יתיר א . Hence, our Masoretic note was meant for Ven, where the word is vocalized: ^לקראים . The following examples are to be explained in the same way as based upon a different type of the Bible text:

2 Ki. 10.5: ^לל וחם : נמליך .

Jer. 2.17: ^לל וחם : מוליכך .

Esth. 2.3: ^לל וחם : תמרוקיהן .

1 Chron. 9.40: ^לל וחדה מלה : ומרי־בעל .

Ex. 17.16: **ה' מלין מן ב אחין : כְּסִיָּה**. This presupposes a division of **כְּסִיָּה** into two words of two letters each: **כְּסִיָּה**, against the text offered here.

§ 12. *The Terminology* (cf. § 5)

Throughout this Masora two distinctly different terminologies are in use. Since the Masora goes back to Masoretic lists (cf. § 10), it is very plausible that in these various Masoretic terms we have the original headings of those lists before us. Sometimes one item is indicated by a combination of two terms, thus forming a doublet.

a) GENERAL TERMS

1. Gen. 3.24: **כול אורית חס : הקרבים**
Gen. 3.17: **ב מל בתור : צויתיק**

Similarly we find the Pentateuch referred to as **אוריתא** and **תורה**, respectively, in an otherwise identical note:

- Lev. 22.16: **לט מל באור : אותם**
Lev. 23.43: **לט מל בתור : אותם**.

2. 1 Chron. 25.4: **ל שם אנש : הותיר**
1 Chron. 25.28: **ל שום גבר : להותיר**.
3. 1 Chron. 11.31: **ל וכל לשון ארמית כוח : איתי**
Dan. 2.10: **ל בלשון חרג : יוכל**.
4. Num. 32.42: **ג לא מפק ה : לה**
Ruth 2.14: **ג רפ : לה**.

b) VOCALIZATION AND ACCENTUATION

5. The *kames* is indicated by **קמצא** or **ק** :

- | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Ex. 15.2: ג קמצ : עזי | Josh. 3.5: ג קמצ : התקדשו |
| Ex. 27.16: ג קמצ : מסך | Josh. 2.15: ג קמצ : יושבת |

The combination of both terms results in a doublet:

Esth. 1.5: קָטַן קָמֶה; the components are: קָמֶה and קָטַן.

If two *kameš* come in succession, the Masora indicates it by קמצינ דסמיכין or , :

Eccl. 4.3: קמצינ דסמ: קָרַע

Eccl. 1.7: קָלַכְתָּ: קָלַ

Combined with the indication of the accentuation (זקפא), the Masoretic note on *kameš* is phrased thus:

Lam. 3.53: ל זק קמ: חָיִי

Lam. 3.35: ל זק: נָבַר

6. The *pataḥ* is indicated by פתחא or _ :

Judg. 16.5: ב פתח: פָּתִי

Judg. 19.11: ל: רָד

Prov. 1.8: יב פת: מוֹסֵר

Prov. 1.3: יב: מוֹסֵר

In connection with the accentuation (אתנחתא), we get:

Ps. 107.35: ג באתנח פת: מִים

Ps. 137.6: ל: יְרוּשָׁלַם

7. The *segol* is indicated by מנוקד בתלת or , :

1 Chron. 15.1: ב מנוקדים בתלת: וְיָט

2 Chron. 18.15: ג: בְּמָה

8. In case the identical word is vocalized sometimes with *kameš* and some other times with *pataḥ*, the Masora indicates it thus:

Ps. 78.50: ז ו פת וא קמ: חָשַׁךְ; the word occurs all in all seven times; six times it is vocalized with פתח, and once with קמץ.

Ps. 72.7: ד ב וב: יִפְרַח; occurs four times; twice , , and twice _ .

9. The **אתנחתא** is indicated:

Ps. 35.20: **בְּאֶרֶץ** : **אֶרֶץ**

Prov. 30.21: **אֶרֶץ** : **אֶרֶץ**

10. A doublet in connection with the indication of the **גרישא** appears in

Ps. 78.17: **לְגַרִישׁ** : **לְמָרוֹת** ; the components are: **לְגַרִישׁ** and **לְ** ; cf. Ps. 104.3: **הַמִּקְרָה** : **לְ** .

c) DETAILS OF SPELLING

11. The fact that a certain letter remains silent in the pronunciation of the word is indicated by the terms **קרי** and **יתיר**:

Eccl. 6.10: **שְׁתַּקִּיף** ק :

Eccl. 10.3: **לְיִתִּיר** ה : **כְּשֶׁהֶסְכֵּל**

Ps. 119.147: **לְדַבֵּרְךָ** ק :

Ps. 119.161: **יִתִּיר** י : **וּמִדְבָּרְךָ**

Esth. 8.7: **בִּיהוּדִים** ק :

Esth. 4.7: **יִתִּיר** י : **בִּיהוּדִים**

Jer. 3.4: **קִרְאָתִי** ק :

Jer. 3.5: **יִתִּיר** י : **דְּבַרְתִּי**

Prov. 28.16: **שֵׁנָא** ק :

Prov. 8.35: **יִתִּיר** י : **מִצָּאִי**

2 Chron. 13.14: **מַחְצָרִים** ק :

2 Chron. 29.28: **יִתִּיר** צ : **מַחְצָרִים**

2 Ki. 16.17: **אֶת** ק :

Neh. 9.17: **יִתִּיר** ו : **וְחֶסֶד**

Judg. 9.12: **מַלְכִּי** ק :

1 Sam. 28.8: **יִתִּיר** ו : **קֶסוֹמִי**

1 Chron. 18.10: לשאל ק: לשאול

Prov. 22.8: יתיר ו: יקצור

The combination of both terms results in a doublet:

Isa. 26.20: יתיר י || דלתך ק: דלתיך

2 Chron. 34.22: יתיר ו || תקהת ק: תוקהת

Ezek. 47.8: ונרפו ק || ל ויתיר א: ונרפאו

12. The omission of a letter of the root from the spelling is indicated by קרי and חסר:

2 Ki. 21.29: אביא ק: אבי

Micah 1.15: ב חס א: אבי

The ב (=twice) in the Masoretic note on the Micah passage refers to 2 Ki. 21.29; accordingly, this occurrence is classed as חסר, too.

A combination of both terms leads to a doublet in

Jer. 32.35: החטיא ק || ב חס: החטי

13. The spelling of the nominal suffix of the 3. pers. sing. masc. with ה is annotated on with: קרי and כתיב or כן כתיב:

Ps. 42.9: שירו ק: שירה

2 Ki. 20.13: ב כת כן: נכתה

Jer. 2.3: ב כת ה: תבואתה

Both terms are combined into a doublet in

Ezek. 48.21: בתוכו ק || ב כת ה: בתוכה

14. The use of א to indicate the vowel *a* in medial position is termed מלא and כתיב:

2 Sam. 12.1: ג מל: ראש

Prov. 10.4: ג כת א: ראש

15. The spelling of the nominal plur. ending as ם without the vowel-letter *yod* is termed חסר and כתיב כן:

Num. 6.5: ב חס :הַיָּמִם

Num. 7.10: ד כת כן :הַנְּשִׂאִים

Both terms are combined to a doublet in

Gen. 17.20: ד חס בתור || כת כן :נְשִׂאִים

d) THE TERM חר

16. It refers to the very passage, in which the Masoretic note belongs to (meaning: this one):

Ezek. 38.7: ב חר חס :הַכֶּן

Amos 4.12: ב חר מל :הַכּוֹן

Dan. 12.4: ב חר חס :יִשְׁטָטוּ

Amos 8.12: ב חר מל :יִשׁוּטָטוּ

Ps. 78.28: ב חר חס :לְמַשְׁכְּנֹתָיו

Ps. 132.7: ב חר מל :לְמַשְׁכְּנֹתָיו

Similarly in Ps. 112.10: ב חר קמ :וְכָעַם, and Isa. 28.28: וְהָמָם: ב חר פת, the term חר refers to these passages, since their respective other occurrence (as indicated by ב) is vocalized: Eccl. 5.16: וְכָעַם (with *pataḥ*) and Deut. 7.23: וְהָמָם (with *kameṣ*).

17. It refers to the other occurrence of the word in question (the cross-reference):

Dan. 10.12: ב חר חס :בְּדִבְרֶיךָ

Ps. 119.42: ב חר מל :בְּדִבְרֶיךָ

Jer. 23.15: ב חר מל :וְהִשְׁקִיתִים refers to Jer. 9.14: וְהִשְׁקִיתִים.

Ps. 139.23: ב חר פת :שָׁרַעַפִּי refers to Ps. 94.19: שָׁרַעַפִּי.

Ps. 60.4: ב חר כת א :רָפָה refers to Num. 12.13: רָפָה.

e) THE IDENTICAL NOTE ON PASSAGES IN A DIFFERENT SPELLING. This uncertainty of the meaning of the term **חד**: whether it refers to the word under consideration or to the cross-reference may best be explained as a result of the fact that these Masoretic notes originate in different sets of Masoretic lists headed by **ב חד מל** and **ב חד חס**, respectively. The later Masorete, in utilizing these lists so as to adorn a Bible manuscript and thus give it additional authority by making it "Masoretic," added his notes to whatever passage he chanced to come across. Little did he concern himself over the implication of the term **חד**; to him, **חד** was merely a word, and not a scientific term with a well-defined connotation.

In order to establish beyond doubt the fact that these Masoretic notes were not meant to serve any practical purpose (as e. g. to direct the scribe or reviser), but that they represent merely annotations from Masoretic lists with corresponding headings, we wish to call attention to the following examples: According to our interpretation they go back to lists, the headings of which were complete. They indicated how often the word under consideration occurs in any spelling, e. g. **מלא** and **חסר**, and not, as heretofore, bringing only one indication: **מלא** or **חסר**, thus leaving it to us to guess at the other missing item:

1 Sam. 26.21: **ב חד כת ס וא ש: הקבלתי**,

Ps. 119.99: **ב חד כת ש וחד כת ס: הקבלתי**

Here we might be tempted to explain **חד** in the first part of each note as referring to the same passage (cf. above under 16), and the second part of each note (**וא ש** and **וחד כת ס**) as later additions, since they are self understood. But how then could we account for the identical notes in the very identical arrangement in cases like:

Lev. 14.6: **ב חד מל וחד חס: השחטה**

Lev. 14.51: **ב חד מל וחד חס: השחטה**

Ex. 9.4: בַּחַד כַּת אֶחָד כַּת הֶ: וְהִפְלָה

Deut. 28.59: בַּחַד כַּת אֶחָד כַּת הֶ: וְהִפְלָא

Nothing but utmost confusion could have been the outcome, if any scribe or reviser would have felt inclined to follow the lead of such directions. They were truly never meant to “guide” them!

IX. THE BIBLIA RABBINICA, VENICE 1524/5

§ 13. *Printer's Mistakes Not Considered* (cf. § 9)

Num. 23.19: בַּ וְהִנֵּה הוֹלִיד בִּן: יַעֲשֶׂה

This is a reference to Ezek. 18.14. In both instances the word is vocalized יַעֲשֶׂה; hence, בַּ is a misprint for בָּ.

Jer. 12.3: בַּ תִּרְאֵנִי; misprint for בָּ; cf. Job 10.18.

Isa. 49.2: לֹא וְאֶחָד לְחַץ: לְחַץ; refers to Thr. 3.12: לֹא וְאֶחָד לְחַץ: לְחַץ; consequently, our note is a misprint for: לֹא וְאֶחָד לְחַץ.

Prov. 17 17: לֹא וְאֶחָד וְאֶחָד: וְאֶחָד; misprint for: לֹא וְאֶחָד וְאֶחָד; cf. Eccl. 4.8: לֹא וְאֶחָד וְאֶחָד.

Ezra 10.8: גִּבְרִי וְאֶחָד: גִּבְרִי; misprint for: גִּבְרִי וְאֶחָד; cf. Ex. 22.19: גִּבְרִי וְאֶחָד וְאֶחָד.

Judg. 5.18: גִּבְרִי וְאֶחָד חֶסֶד: מְרוֹמִי; mistake for: גִּבְרִי וְאֶחָד חֶסֶד; cf. Prov. 9.3, 14: מְרוֹמִי.

1 Ki. 7.36: מִסְגֵּרֶתִיָּה קֶ: וּמִסְגֵּרֶתִיָּה; misprint for: מִסְגֵּרֶתִיָּה קֶ, without the *waw*.

2 Ki. 24.14: עֲשֶׂרֶה קֶ: עֲשֶׂרֶה; mistake for: עֲשֶׂרֶת קֶ.

Num. 7.60: The lengthy Masoretic note beginning with לְגִלְגָּלֶתֶם is merely a reprinting of the identical note on Num. 1.22: s. v. לְגִלְגָּלֶתֶם, and is here out of place.

תלתיהון נמסרו לעיל בדף שמתחיל: בְּרָכִים: וְגַם אֲנֹכִי: 2 Sam. 2.5, 6

בלי משיח בשמן. יען כי נשמטו
מפה בהדפסה. On the indicated
page these Masoretic notes are
not to be found in the Masora
Parva, but they are included in
the Masora Magna.

Lev. 23.17: תְּבִיאוּ; but actually the א has no *dagesh*.

Gen. 11.32: בְּקָרָן; but the text has a regular *nun*.

Josh. 14.11: לְוָהוּא מִן אֲבִי רַבְתִּי: כְּכַחֲ; but the text has a normal sized כ.

§ 14. The Masora Originates in Masoretic Lists

(cf. §§ 1 and 10)

Gen. 2.14: לְוָהוּא מִן חֹדֶר חֹדֶר פֶּתַח וְחֹדֶר קִמְצָה: חֹדֶרָקֶל. דְּלֹג. Here פֶּתַח obviously means *segol*, unless we assume that this list is of Babylonian origin, where פ served as the equivalent for both פ and פֿ.

Gen. 32.12: אֲבִי מִן חֹדֶר חֹדֶר פֶּתַח וְחֹדֶר קִמְצָה. דְּלֹג: וְהַכֵּנִי:

Gen. 13.9: וְיִפְסֹוּ דְאִיתָ בְּהוֹן אִם וְאִם בְּאִמְצַע פְּסֹוּ: אִם: cf. on

Gen. 31.52: וְיִפְסֹוּ אִם וְאִם מְצַעֵו פְּסֹוּ בְּתוֹרָה: אִם: and on

Gen. 24.49: וְיִפְסֹוּ בְּתוֹרָה וִירְמִיָּה אִם וְאִם מְצַעֵו פְּסֹוּק: אִם:

Gen. 35.5: בְּאִרְפָּא וְאִרְפָּא. וְהוּא חֹדֶר מִן כְּזֹגִין אִרְפָּא וְאִרְפָּא: וְיִפְסֹוּ:

Gen. 23.16: טַפְסֹוּ מִן בְּמִלִּין. קִדְמָא מִלְּתִי חֶסֶךְ: עֲפָרוֹן:

Gen. 17.24: בְּזֹגִין. קִדְמָא לֹא נִסְבָּא אֶת תַּנִּין נִסְבָּא אֶת: בְּהַמְלֹו:

Gen. 49.20: חֹדֶר מִן גְּפְסֹוּ מִן זְמִלִין. גְּמַכָּא וְגְּמַכָּא. וְהוּא בְּאִמְצָ: וְהוּא:

1 Sam. 26.23: גְּפְסֹוּ רִישִׁי וְסוּפִי אִזְכָּרָה: יְהוֹה:

Isa. 18.13: לְפְסֹוּ רִישִׁי וְסוּפִי זִינָן: זָה:

Lev. 23.42: יֵא פְסוּקִים רִישִׁיהוֹן וְסוּפִיהוֹן חֹדֶר: בְּסִכְתָּ:

§ 15. *Rabbinic Sources Utilized*

§ 16. *The Text Contradicts the Masora (cf. §§ 2 and 11)*

Num. 14.27: תְּלֹנֹת; שְׁמַעְתִּי אֵת: בְּכָתִיב כֵּן בַּחֹר. this refers to the passage Ex. 16.12: תְּלֹנֹת: בְּכָתִיב כֵּן.

- Josh. 2.16: **שוב אליך**: שב; but Gen. 18.10 referred to here, has **שוב** in *plene* spelling.
- 2 Sam. 7.18: **הביאתני**: דין חס; cf. the Masoretic note on the second occurrence of this word 1 Chron. 17.16: **הביאתני**: ו חס; occurs twice without a *waw*!
- 2 Sam. 19.6: **הובשת**: ב חס; cf. the identical spelling in Ps. 74.15: **הובשת**: ב בתרי ליש.
- 1 Ki. 20.31: **בראשנו**: ב חס; but the passage referred to, Josh. 2.19, reads equally: **בראשנו**: ב וחבלים.
- Jer. 38.22: **שלמך**: ב חס; Since the spelling of the word here is **חסר**, we expect the **מלא** spelling in the other instance; but cf. Obad. 7: **שלמך**: ב חס!
- Ezek. 39.3: **שמאלך**: ב חס; but cf. the identical spelling 2 Sam. 2.21.
- Ps. 11.2: **לירות**: ב חס and Ps. 64.5: **לירות**: ב חס exclude one another. The same is true of
- Ps. 78.28: **למשכנותיו**: ב חס and Ps. 132.7: **למשכנותיו**: ב חס.
- Ps. 76.12: **יובילו**: ב חס; but cf. Ps. 68.30: **יובילו**.
- Ps. 106.8: **ניושיעם**: ד חס; but cf. the *plene* spelling in all the three other occurrences, too: 2 Ki. 14.27; Judg. 3.9; Ps. 106.10.
- Job 40.13: **חבוש**: ג חס; Ezek. 24.17: **חבוש**: ג חס; and the third occurrence Isa. 30.26: **חבש**: ג make it clear that Job and Ezek. with their *plene* spelling exclude one another.

b) THE MASORA CONTRADICTS ITS OWN CATCHWORD.

- Isa. 2.15: **מגדל**: ויעזקהו; presupposes a vocalization **מגדל**, cf. Isa. 5.2: **מגדל**: ו על כל. The Masoretic notes on these passages refer to one another.

- Isa. 26.20: יַעֲבֹר מַלְאָכָיו; but cf. the way the word is vocalized in Isa. 40.27: יַעֲבֹר מַלְאָכָיו.
- Josh. 19.8: רָמַת אֶל כְּתִיב אֶל, presupposes a spelling רָמַת, cf. BHKK.
- Josh. 19.49: דְּאֹרֵיית חֶסֶד דִּיהוֹשֻׁעַ מַלְאָכָיו לְגִבּוֹלְתֵיהֶּן; cf. BHKK: לגבולתיה.
- 1 Sam. 4.7: שְׁלֹשָׁם; cf. BHKK: שלשם.
- Isa. 59.19: לֹחַם וְחֶסֶד נֹסֶסָה.
- Jer. 8.5: בְּחֶסֶד בְּתִרְמִית.
- Jer. 8.9: בְּחֶסֶד דָּחַם; cf. ib. verse 12: הִבִּישׁוּ.
- Judg. 1.3: בְּגֹרֶלֶךָ; cf. BHKK: בגורלך.
- Judg. 9.37: יֹרְדִים; cf. BHKK: יורדים.
- Isa. 59.19: הֵד מִלְּוִדִין חֶסֶד וְיִירָאוּ.

§ 17. The Terminology (cf. §§ 5 and 12)

a) GENERAL TERMS

1. Gen. 18.33: כָּל אֹרֵי חֶסֶד לְמַקְמוֹ
Gen. 19.22: לֹחַם בְּתוֹ: בְּאֵךְ
Gen. 5.7: כָּל אֹרֵי חֶסֶד וְשִׁמְנָה
Gen. 3.24: כָּל הַתּוֹרָה חֶסֶד: הַכְּרָבִים

2. Deut. 32.4: לֹחַם רַבְתִּי: הַצּוֹר
Deut. 32.6: הַגְּדוֹלָה: הַלִּיהוּה

Both terms appear combined in a doublet:

Lev. 13.33: גִּרְבָּתִי || מְאוֹתֵי גְדוֹלוֹת: וְהַתְּגַלָּח

3. The various terms for small letters are contained in the following doublets:

Num. 25.12: וְזוֹטָא || וְהָיָא חֶד מְאֹב מְאוֹתֵי קְטָנוֹת: שְׁלוֹם
Gen. 27.46: קוֹף זַעִיר | מִן אֵב מְאוֹתֵי קְטָנוֹת: קֶצֶתִי

4. Ex. 35.34: בַּחֵם וַיֵּזְבֵּז בְּתֵרָא: וְלִהְיוֹרֶת:
 Lev. 10.11: בַּחֵם וְתַנְיִין: וְלִהְיוֹרֶת:

5. Ezek. 7.22: בַּחֵד חֵם: פְּרִי־צִים:
 Jer. 32.29: בַּאֲחֵם: גִּגּוֹתֵיהֶם:

b) VOCALIZATION AND ACCENTUATION

6. Gen. 32.27: לֵקֶמֶץ: בִּרְכָתָנִי:
 Gen. 24.19: לֵאשָׁאָב:
 Gen. 27.39: גִּקְמָ: מֵעַל:
 Gen. 17.12: דָּ: בֵּית:
 7. Gen. 16.13: לֵחֹטֶף קֶמֶץ: רְאִי:
 Ex. 30.23: לֵאֲקִנְמָן:
 Jer. 49.28: לֵחֹטֶף: וְשִׁדְדוּ:
 Ezek. 16.33: לֵאֲחֻשְׁחָדִי:
 8. Isa. 27.12: זֶפֶתַח: לְאַחֵד:
 Isa. 28.28: לֵגִלְגִּל:
 9. Lev. 16.13: דִּחְטָפִין פֶּתַחִין: עֲנֵן:
 Isa. 44.13: לֵאֲתָאֲרֵהוּ:
 10. Deut. 5.10: גִּבְסַפֵּר בַּסְגּוּל: וְעָשָׂה:
 Deut. 10.18: גִּעָשָׂה:
 Isa. 8.7: חֲסֻגּוּל: מֵעַלָּה:
 Isa. 19.4: הָ: קָשָׁה:
 1 Ki. 16.24: לֵסֻגּוּל: מֵאֶת:
 Ex. 13.2: לֵרַפָּ: קָדָשׁ:
 11. Lev. 18.15: כָּל חֲסוּפֵי בִצְרִי: תִּגְלָה:
 Ex. 15.11: חָ: עָשָׂה:
 1 Ki. 10.25: גִּבְצִירִי בִלִּישׁ: וְנִשְׁקָה:
 1 Ki. 10.1: הָ: שִׁמְעָה:
 12. Gen. 41.43: לֵבִנְקוּדָה אַחַת: בְּמִרְכָּבָת:
 1 Sam. 29.3: לֵוַחַד אַחֲרֵי נִפְלוּ: נִפְלוּ:

13. ל מל פום. וחד קבוץ פום: וכעת מותה: מוֹתָה: 2 Sam. 6.23
 ל: נָטַשׁ: Isa. 32.14

14. ל פתח וב קמץ: הִצֵּר: Num. 10.9
 ל וֹד: וּמִסְפָּר: Num. 23.10
 ל קמ וא פת: וְאַבְרָהָם: Gen. 27.33
 ב א וא: וְאַבְרָהָם: Isa. 51.2
 ב א פת וא קמ: הִמּוּשׁב: Gen. 43.12
 ב א וא: תִּשָּׂם: Gen. 47.19
 ל וחד ל: לִיבָשָׁה: Gen. 1.10

15. Two different vowel-signs coming in succession are indicated by:

- ל קמ ופת: חִנָּן: Gen. 33.5
 הֶֿ: חִזֹּק: Gen. 41.57

The variety of sources whence these notes emanate, leads to a corresponding difference in the annotations on the identical word: Num. 5.7: אֲשֶׁם בִּפְתַחִין refers to the second vowel only; but Lev. 5.19: אֲשֶׁם בִּֿ reflects both vowel-signs.

16. The vocalization of *waw* with verbal forms as copular or as consecutive *waw* is indicated by referring to the following consonant: whether or not it carries a *dagesh*:

- ל רפי וחד דגש: וְתָמַח: Isa. 50.2
 ל רפי וחד וִירָכְסוּ: וְיִרְכְּסוּ: Ex. 28.28
 יא פתחי באתנחת: אֲרָחִם: Hos. 2.6
 ח קמץ וכל אסף דכו במבֿֿ: אֱלֹהֵי: 1 Ki. 3.6

c) DETAILS OF SPELLING

18. The terms קרי and יתיר interchangeably used:

- דברך ק: דְּבָרֶיךָ: 1 Ki. 22.13
 יתיר יו"ד: וּבְדָבָרֶיךָ: 1 Ki. 18.36

עבדך ק: עבְדִּיךָ: 1 Ki. 1.27

יתיר יו"ד: חֲסִידִיךָ: Ps. 16.10

למדת ק: לְמַדְתִּי: Jer. 2.33

יתיר יו"ד: לְמַדְתִּי: Jer. 13.21

הרע ק: הָרַעָה: Jer. 18.10

יתיר ה: וְרָעָה: Prov. 27.10

Both terms combined result in a doublet:

ופי ק || יתיר נון: וּפְנִי: Prov. 15.14

19. the terms מלא and קרי; חסר and קרי:

α) וידיו ק: וַיָּדָו: Job 5.18

ה חס: יָדָו: Lev. 16.21

Both terms appear together in the doublet

ידיו ק || ה חס: יָדָו: Ezek. 43.26

1 Sam. 18.22: עבְדִּי ק: עֲבָדָו; the equivalent term חסר is to be found in the doublet Jer. 22.4: וְעֲבָדָו ב חס: וַעֲבָדָו.

Similarly: 1 Ki. 6.38: מִשְׁפָּטָיו ק || ב חס: מִשְׁפָּטָיו.

β) 2 Sam. 23.16: מִבְּאֵר ק: מִבְּאֵר; the equivalent term מלא occurs in the doublet ib. verse 15: מִבְּאֵר ק || ג מל אלף: מִבְּאֵר.

The third occurrence of the word in this spelling, referred to here, is ib. verse 20: הַבְּאֵר ק: הַבְּאֵר.

וגדל ק: וַגְּדֹל: Nah. 1.3

ב חד מל: וַגְּדֹל: Ps. 145.8

The term חד proves that this note belongs to a different textual type of the Bible, in which one of these two passages had the word in *defective* spelling; cf. BHKK on Ps. 145.8: וַגְּדֹל ב חד מל.

20. the terms קרי and כתיב or כתיב כן:

α) כסותו ק: כְּסוּתָהּ: Ex. 22.26

ד כתיב כן: אֶהְיֶה: Gen. 9.21

Josh. 15.48: **כו ק**: וְשׁוֹכֵה
 2 Sam. 9.4: **י כתיב כן**: אִיפֹה

β) the equivalent term can now be traced in a doublet only:

2 Ki. 14.13: **ויבאו ק**: וַיָּבֹאוּ; cf. both terms in: 2 Ki. 12.21: **ויבאו**:
ויבא ק || **ג ככ**.

Jer. 31.39: **קו ק**: קוּה; cf. 1 Ki. 7.23: **וקוה**: **ג ככ**
 Ezek. 16.36: **נתח ק** || **ב ככ**: נִתְחִי; cf. ib. verse 18: **נתח ק**: נִתְחִי
 Ps. 140.13: **ידעתי ק** || **ב ככ**: יִדְעֶתָ; cf. Job 42.2: **ידעתי ק**: יִדְעֶתָ

γ) the components of the doublets cannot be traced separately:

Josh. 11.16: **ל וככ** || **תו ק**: וְשַׁפְּלָתָה
 1 Ki. 14.2: **ה כתי י** || **את ק**: אֲתִי
 Josh. 3.4: **ניו ק** || **ב כתי כן**: וּבִינּוּ
 1 Sam. 24.19: **ואתה ק** || **ז ככ**: וְאַתָּה
 Isa. 9.2: **לו ק** || **טו ככ**: לֹא

21. the terms **חסר** and **כתיב כן**:

The fact that the plural of **יד** in connection with the suffix of the 3. pers. masc. sing. appears in the *defective* spelling **ידו**, is termed as follows:

Ex. 32.19: **דיו ק** || **ה ככ**: מִיָּדוּ
 Lev. 9.22: **ידיו ק** || **ה כתיב ידו וקרין ידיו**: יָדָיו
 Ezek. 43.26: **ידיו ק** || **ה חס**: יָדָיו

Hence, the terms **חסר** and **כתיב כן** are interchangeably used in order to indicate one and the same spelling. They go back to different lists; cf. Deut. 32.35: **ל וכתי כן. ובסא נמסר ל**: עֲתֶרֶת **ל**.
חס דחס.

22. the terms **יתיר** and **מלא**:

Josh. 18.20: **יתיר ז**: יִגְבֹּל
 Isa. 11.3: **ז מל**: יִשְׁפּוּט
 Ps. 89.29: **יתיר וי"ו**: אֶשְׁמֹר
 Isa. 26.20: **ז מל**: יַעֲבֹר

Josh. 6.3: יתיר יו"ד: הַקִּיף
 ל מל: וְהִקְטִיר: 1 Ki. 9.25:

23. the terms יתיר and כתיב:

2 Sam. 11.1: יתיר א: הַמְלָאכִים
 2 Sam. 12.1: ג כתיב אלף: רָאשׁ
 2 Sam. 11.24: יתיר אלף: הַמִּזְרָאִים
 Isa. 30.5: ל כתיב כן: הַבְּאִישׁ
 Jer. 30.16: ל ויתיר א: שֹׁאֲסִיף
 1 Ki. 4.11: ד כתי א: דָּאֵר

A combination of both terms results in a doublet:

Hos. 4.6: ל וכתבי כן || יתיר א: וְאֶמְאָסָאף
 Josh. 21.32: ג ככ || יתיר א: דָּאֵר

24. the terms כתיב and מלא:

The absence of a *waaw* to signify the vowel *o* is termed as follows:

1 Ki. 8.18: ב חדר כתי הטיבות: הַטִּיבֹת
 Ezek. 16.7: ב א מל: נִכְנֹו

25. the terms כתיב and כן:

2 Sam. 12.1: ג כתיב אלף: רָאשׁ
 Prov. 10.4: ג כתיב כן: רָאשׁ
 Lev. 21.6: ט כתי יו"ד: אֲשִׁי
 Lev. 21.21: ט כתי כן: אֲשִׁי

2 Sam. 9.4: י כתי כן: אִיפָה; both terms combined: 1 Sam. 19.22:

י כתי כן || בה"א: אִיפָה

Judg. 21.19: ח כתי וי"ו בסוף: בְּשָׁלוּ; both terms: 1 Sam. 3.21:

ח ככ || בוי"ו: בְּשָׁלוּ

26. the terms חסר and כן:

1 Ki. 21.9: ב חס וי"ו: וְהִשִּׁיבוּ
 1 Ki. 21.12: ב ככ ובענין: וְהִשִּׁיבוּ

Gen. 17.20: ד חס י בתר בתו: נשיאם

Gen. 25.16: ד ככ בתור: נשיאם

Lev. 5.16: ד חס יו"ד תניין: חמישתו; the equivalent term in the doublet: Lev. 27.13: ד חס יו"ד תניין: חמישתו

Ezek. 16.43: ה כתי כן: תועבתיך; the equivalent term in the doublet: Ezek. 5.11: חס ו בתר: תועבתיך

Both terms appear combined in doublets:

Deut. 17.8: ל ככ || חס וי"ו: ריבת

Micah 4.3: ג ככ || חס וי"ו: עצמים

Jer. 2.17: ל וככ || חס י: מולכך

Jer. 2.18: ל ככ || חס י: שחר

Deut. 1.32: ל וככ || חס יו"ד בתר: מאמינם

Deut. 4.13: ה ככ בתור || חס וי"ו קדמ: לחות

Jer. 6.20: ב ככ || חס וי"ו קדמ: עלותיכם

27. specification of the vowel-letter referred to:

From the Masoretic note on the passage Josh. 22.27: דרותינו: ב ובענין. חר מל וחר חס דחם. ובסא נמסר: חר מל וי"ו קדמ וחר חס we learn that while the terms in general use מל or חס had no reference as to which vowel-letter was meant by this remark, certain manuscripts were more specific in their terminology. Cf. the following examples:

α) Lev. 14.4: כל חס וי"ו קדמ: טהרות

β) 1 Ki. 7.2: ב חס וי"ו קדמ: וכרתות

γ) 1 Sam. 1.20: ל וחס וי"ו קדמ: לתקפות

δ) Lev. 14.37: ל וחס וי"ו בתר: שקערורת

ε) Lev. 23.17: ל ומל ו קדמ: ממושבתים

ζ) Jer. 33.11: חס יו"ד קדמ: מבאים

η) 1 Sam. 20.13: ב חס יו"ד בתר: ייטב

θ) 2 Ki. 4.44: ב חס יו"ד בתר: ויותרו

d) THE TERM חָד REFERS TO THE CROSS-REFERENCE

בְּ חָד מֵל: וְעִינְכֶם: Ezek. 33.25:

בְּ חָד חֹס: וְעִינְכֶם: Mal. 1.5:

בְּ חָד מֵל: לְרַפָּא: Hos. 5.13:

בְּ חָד חֹס: לְרַפּוּא: Eccl. 3.3:

בְּ חָד כְּתִי אֶ: כְּלִי־תִי: Ps. 39.11:

בְּ חָד כְּתִי יִ: כְּלֵא־תִי: Ps. 119.101:

בְּ חָד כְּתִי אֶ: דְּבִיתָ: Ps. 51.10:

בְּ חָד כְּתִי יוֹד: דְּבִא־תָ: Ps. 89.11:

Hab. 1.5: יִסְפָּר: בְּ חָד פֹּחַ: יִסְפָּר: refers to Ps. 22.31:

Job 21.4: תִּקְצָר: בְּ חָד קִמָּץ: תִּקְצָר: refers to Num. 11.23:

With our finding (above under a 5) in mind that חָד and אֶחָד are interchangeably used, cf. also

Ezek. 16.7: נִכְוֵנוּ: בְּ אֶ מֵל: נִכְוֵנוּ: cf. Prov. 19.29:

Lev. 14.6: הִשְׁחֻטָּה: לְ חֹס וְאֶ מֵל: הִשְׁחֻטָּה: cf. Lev. 14.51:

Of the usage of the term חָד to indicate the very passage under observation (cf. § 12 d 16), I came across these two instances only:

Hab. 1.16: בְּ חָד חֹס: בְּרִאָה: the cross-reference Num. 16.30:

בְּרִאָה is in *plene* spelling.

Micah 1.4: בְּמוֹרֵד: בְּ חָד קִמָּץ: cf. Josh. 10.11 and Jer. 48.5:

בְּמוֹרֵד with *patah*.

e) THE IDENTICAL NOTES ON PASSAGES IN A DIFFERENT SPELLING (cf. § 12 e).

Jer. 32.8: גְּ בְ חֹס וְאֶ מֵל: דְּוֹדִי:

Jer. 32.9: גְּ בְ חֹס וְאֶ מֵל: דְּדִי:

ב חר מל וחר חס: הרוֹאֶה: 2 Sam. 15.27:

ב חר מל וחר חס: הִרְאָה: Ezek. 8.6:

ב א חס וא מל: וְהִשְׁבֹּתֶם: 2 Chron. 6.25:

ב חר חס וחר מל: וְהִשְׁבֹּתֶם: 1 Ki. 8.34:

ד ג מל וא חס: אָרוּץ: 2 Sam. 22.30:

ד ג מל וא חס: אָרַץ: Ps. 18.30:

f) THE TERM דִּין

ג דין מל: וּמוֹפְתֵיו: Ps. 78.43:

ב ודין חס: בְּאֵלֶם: Ex. 15.11:

ב דין חס: זָכָה: Lev. 15.19:

ב דין חס: הוֹלֵדוֹ: Ezek. 47.22:

The use of the term דִּין in conjunction with חר results in a doublet; cf. Lev. 13.45: ב חר חס: פָּרוּעַ; this note refers (according to subdivision d) to the second occurrence, namely Ex. 32.25 where we actually find פָּרַע in *defective* spelling. On this second passage the Masora notes: ב א מל ודין חס. This is obviously a combination of ב א מל (referring to Lev. 13.45) and ב ודין חס. Similarly we shall have to explain as doublets the following instances:

ב חר חס || ודין מל: הִרְאוּתָּהּ: Ezek. 40.4:

ב א חס || דין מל: הָאוֹתִי: Jer. 5.22:

ג ב פתחי || ודין קמ: יִחָרֶם: Ex. 22.19:

On Ezek. 3.17: וְהִזְהַרְתָּ the Masora remarks: ג ב חס וא מל. This might be considered merely as an amplification of an original note: ג ב חס; for now it is self understood that the one remaining instance is in *plene* spelling. However, as the note reads, it does not clearly indicate the way how the instance

under consideration (Ezek. 3.17) is spelled. Clarity is achieved by employing the term **דין**; cf. Ex. 18.20: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**; cf. Ex. 18.20: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**. Compare the note on Ezek. 3.17 with that on Ex. 18.20, and it becomes at once evident that in Ex. 18.20 we have a doublet: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** || **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**. A similar case is Lev. 25.45: **הוֹלִידוּ: דִּין**; cf. Ezek. 47.22: **הוֹלִידוּ: דִּין**. We have thus demonstrated the separate use of each component and their combination into a doublet. Consequently we shall regard as doublets Masoretic notes as the following:

- 2 Sam. 2.12: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** || **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**
 Ex. 38.18: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** || **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**
 Ex. 28.20: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** || **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**
 Ex. 7.12: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** || **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**
 2 Sam. 7.18: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** || **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**
 1 Sam. 17.24: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** || **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**
 Isa. 50.1: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** || **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**
 2 Sam. 19.42: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** || **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**
 Ex. 32.10: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** || **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**
 Lev. 14.51: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** || **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**

In a similar way, the Masoretic note on 1 Ki. 12.27: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** was expanded into a doublet on Gen. 20.11: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** || **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**. For the separate use of the second component cf. similarly Gen. 24.10: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין**, a reference to 2 Ki. 8.9. Consequently, 1 Sam. 28.6: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** is a doublet, too; the cross-reference is to Isa. 24.15. The apparent anomaly in the note: **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** (while **וְהִזְקִיתָּהּ: דִּין** is quoted in *plene* spelling!) reflects only carelessness of the scribe or printer; cf. similarly on

Deut. 32.47: **וּבְרָכָר הָזֶה** the Masoretic note **בְּ אֵינְכֶם מֵאֲמִינִים**, which refers to Deut. 1.32 where the word occurs in *defective* spelling: **לֹכֵךְ || חֵס יוֹד בְּתָר : מֵאֲמִינִים**.

D. JACOB BEN CHAYIM AS EDITOR

X. THE MASORETIC TEXT IS ECLECTICALLY ESTABLISHED

Jacob ben Chayim does not follow any manuscript or authority in every detail, but uses his own judgment. Though a Spanish manuscript served him as a basis for his work, he nevertheless deviates from it occasionally; cf. on Gen. 19.13. In Num. 5.27 he accepts the vocalization of Ben Asher, but in Jer. 25.29 he follows Ben Naphtali. Similarly he sometimes exhibits the readings of the **מַעֲרֵבָאִי** in his text, and on other occasions those of the **מִדְנַחָאִי**. He thus proceeds according to the eclectic method. But we are at a complete loss, when searching for the underlying principles.

§ 18. *Authorities Quoted for Doubtful Readings*

a) REFERRING TO THE SPELLING-TEXT

Gen. 19.13: **וּבְסֵפֶר אֲסַפְמִיָּא אֲשֶׁר נִסְמַךְ עָלָיו נִמְצָא: אֵל : אֶת הַמָּקוֹם**
הַמָּקוֹם

Gen. 25.14: **וּבְסֵפֶר אֲסַפְמִיָּא אֲשֶׁר נִסְמַךְ עָלָיו: דּוּמָה בִּה"א. : וְדוּמָה**
וְכֵן אוֹמַר בְּעַל הַמִּסּוֹר. וּבְרֹב סִפְרֵי נִמְצָא: דּוּמָה
בְּאֵלֶּף

Gen. 27.3: **הָ יִתִּיר. אֲבָל פְּלוּגָת דְּרַב נַחֲמָן. וְהִיא חֵד מִן : צִידָה**
כֹּא תִיבִין כְּתִי הָ בְּסוּף תִּיבוֹת וְלֹא קָרִי

Ps. 105.22: **לִפִּי דַעַת רַב אִידִי בְּבִר שָׁרוּ כְּתִי שָׁרִיו ק :** שָׁרִיו

Deut. 32.6: **לִסּוּרָאִי הָ לַחּוֹד לִי"י לַחּוֹד. לְנַהֲרָדְעִי הֵל : הִלְיָהוּה**
לַחּוֹד י"י לַחּוֹד. לְסִפְרֵי אַחֲרֵי חֲדָא מִלְתָּא

b) REFERRING TO THE VOCALIZATION-TEXT

Gen. 26.35: כֵּן נִמְצָא בְּסִפְרֵי אֲסַפְמִיא וּבִשְׁם הַחֹר שִׁמְשׁוֹן : וְנִתְּהִיין ,
וּכְּנִי דִינוּ

Gen. 18.15: כָּל הַנִּקְדָּנִים מִנִּקְדִּים בִּפְתַּח. וְהָרִ"ר מֶשֶׁה : וְנִתְּכַחַשׁ :
מִלּוֹנֶדֶרֶשׁ אָמַר : שֶׁהוּא בְּקִמָּץ. לִפִּי שֶׁלֹּא הִיטָה
רְגִילָה לִכְחַשׁ

Num. 7.85: ל. וּפְלִיג רַב יוֹסֵף : הִקְעָרָה : הִקְעָרָה :
בְּקִצַּת סִפְרִים מִצִּאֲתֵי קִמּוּץ. אֲבָל רַ' יוֹסֵף זִרְקָא : אָכַל :
כָּתְבוּ פֶתוּחַ. וּמִסֵּר עָלָיו : דֹּאכִיל פֶּתַח פּוּמִיָּה.
דִּלָּא אֲכַל קִמָּץ פּוּמִיָּה

Lev. 4.35: כֵּן נִמְצָא בְּחֹמֶשׁ אֶחָד. שֶׁכָּתַב וְנִקְדַּר רַבִּינוּ : יוֹסֵר חֶלֶב :
גִּרְשָׁם מִפְּרִי"ז : כֹּאשֶׁר יוֹסֵר אֲזֵלָא וּבִּמְוִנָּחִים

c) DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BEN ASHER AND BEN NAPHTALI

Ex. 21.19: פְּלוּגְתָא דְּבֵן אִשֶּׁר וּבֵן נִפְתָּלִי. דִּין אֲלִיבָא דְּבֵן : וְהִתְהַלֵּךְ :
אִשֶּׁר

Num. 5.27: לְבֵן אִשֶּׁר כֵּן נִיְקוּדוֹ : הִמְאָרְרִים :

Jer. 25.29: לְבֵן נִפְתָּלִי : אֲשֶׁר־נִקְרָא :

d) מְדִינַחַאי AND מְעַרְבָּאי

α) the text exhibits the מְדִינַחַאי-reading:

1 Ki. 16.1: ל. לְמַעַרְבָּאִי : אֵל בַּעֲשָׂא : עַל־בְּעָשָׂא :
לְמַעַרְבָּאִי מַלְאָכִי. לְמַדְנַחַאי בְּחָס : וּלְבִי עַר. וְדִין : יִשְׁנָה :
לְמַדְנַחַאי חָס : כִּדְבָרָךְ : 1 Ki. 3.12 :

•

β) the text exhibits the מְעַרְבָּאי-reading:

1 Sam. 1.3: לְמַעַרְבָּאִי חָס. לְמַדְנַחַאי מַלְאָכִי : וּפְנִיחָס :
2 Sam. 6.23: לְמַדְנַחַאי כְּתִי וְלֹד : יִלְד :

(סא יכניהו : יְכַנֵּיה : § 22γ) cf. למדנחאי : צדקיה : צדקיהו : Jer. 34.2
 מדינחאי : מי כתי . מה קרי : מה : Micah 6.5
 ל . מדנחאי פתהן : פתהן : Isa. 3.17

§ 19. *The Masoretic Tradition at Variance*

Cf. Jacob ben Chayim's statement in his *Introduction*: ובמקומות שמצאתי הפרש בין ספרי המסרה. זה אומר בכה. וזה אומר בכה. הבאתי דעות שניהם.

ב וככ. ובסא נמסר: ל מל השליו: השליו: Ex. 16.13
 דין חס תניין מל. ובמסר אחרת נמסר: ב וכתי כן: מקבילת: Ex. 26.5
 ל מל. ובסא נמסר: ב מל: עבדוהו: Judg. 10.6
 סא נמסר עליו: ב חס בליש: ברחוב: Judg. 19.17
 ל. ובסא נמסר: ל וחס: השאלתיהו: 1 Sam. 1.28
 ל. סא נמסר: ב: ומהמונס: Isa. 31.4
 ב מל. סא: ל מל: מחשבותם: Jer. 6.19
 ל חס. סא: ב חס: המחשבת: Jer. 29.11
 ל ומל. ובסא: והורתיך. ונמסר עליו: ל וככ: והוריתיך: Ex. 4.12
 ד ג חס ו ודין מל. ויס: דין חס וא"ו: מגוריהם: Gen. 36.7
 חס. ופלוגתא עליה. אית סיפרי דמסר: (2^o) אבשלם: 2 Sam. 17.14
 נמסר: טו חס. ואית סיפרי נמסר: יד
 חס. ואין מונין זה מן המנין
 כול כן: חס יו"ד. ובסא זקן ומדויק: כול חס י: מגרשה: Josh. 21.11
 במב: חברון. לבנה
 חד מן ה מל(ו). ובסא נמסר עליו: ד חס. וכן: הנמן: Gen. 49.21
 הוא בתיקון סת חס וברוב הספרים
 כן כתוב. ובתיקון סת ראיתי: דחבת חס. רחבות: Gen. 26.22
 ומוגה חס
 כן כתי וקרי מכח מסה: לעיר: Josh. 8.12
 עשית ק. וברוב הספרים בדקתי ולא מצאתי: עשיתי: 2 Sam. 14.21
 זה קרי וכתי כי אם אחד מני אלף

Isa. 38.14: בקצת ספרי כתי כסים וקרי כסוס. אמנם לא :כסוס
מצאתיו שנמנה עם אות הכתובי יו"ד באמצע
תיבות וק וי"ו

Ps. 24.4: נפשי ק. ותימא דלא נמנה במסורה גדולה מאינן :נפשו
דכתיבין וי"ו בסוף תיבות וקריין יו"ד

§ 20. *Masora and Text-Tradition at Variance*

On Prov. 23.5: עשה the marginal Masora states: עיין במסר רבת. In the Masora *finalis* referred to we read ד ככ. וסימ נמסר בירמיה סי ככ. ועיין שם מה דאקשינן :עשו s. v. (we re-arranged here the somewhat confused word-order of the statement). In a note on the passage Jer. 22.4 referred to, the problem is clearly formulated: עשו: ד כתיב ו בסוף. וסימ: דרכך. ומעלליך. כי אם הטיב תטיבו. כי אם עשו תעשו את הדבר הזה. ואתנהו ביד איל גוים. ויש ספרים נמסר: בזנותך אחר גוים. במקום: אם עשו תעשו. דסיפרא. ובדקתי אחכ בספרים מדוייקים ומצאתיו בה"א. ותמיה לי: אם כן למה לא נמנה עם אותם ד עשה שהם כתובים בה"א. ואם נאמר: שהוא בוי"ו. אם כן נשבש כל הספרים המדוייקים. שבכלם נמסר על כל אחד מהד עשו: ד כתיב וי"ו. וגם ספרי המסר. ועוד תמיה לי: למה נמנה הסכלת עשו דאורייתא עם הד כתיב ה. מאחר שהוא בוי"ו. ונמסר עליו: לית כתיב וי"ו. ימנה אותו עם אותם שהם בוי"ו. ונתקשיתי בהאי עניינא טובא. ולא ידענא מה למימר ביה. "The word עשו occurs four times in this spelling, with *ww* as final letter. These passages are: Jer. 4.18; ib. 7.5; ib. 22.4 and Ezek. 31.11. In some manuscripts the Masora substitutes Ezek. 23.30 for Jer. 22.4 of our list. I, therefore, examined manuscripts which are reputed as correct, and found the instance Ezek. 23.30 spelled with ה. But now I wonder. Since Ezek. 23.30 is spelled עשה with ה, why is this passage not enumerated together with the four other occurrences of עשה in this spelling with ה? (According to our Bible, עשה with ה at the end occurs eight times!). This argument might be taken as a proof that in

Ezek. 23.30 עשו should be spelled, with *waw*. But if so, then all those manuscripts which are reputed as correct turn out to be incorrect, for in all of them there occurs a Masoretic note on each of the four passages (mentioned above) stating: עשו occurs 4 times with ו. The same is true of the Masoretic compilations. There is even another fact that puzzles me: why is עשו in the passage Gen. 31.28 enumerated among the four occurrences of עשה with ה? This passage is not only spelled with ו in the text, but also has a Masoretic note saying: this is the only occurrence of this form (construct infinitive) with ו! Let the Masora enumerate this passage together with the other instances of spelling עשו with *waw*! I did much hard thinking on this subject. Still I do not know how to explain it."

§ 21. *The Text is Made to Conform with the Masora*

Whenever feasible the reading of the text is selected — or revised — in such a manner as to conform to the respective Masoretic list:

Gen. 25.25: ברוב הספרי חס. ולפי המסורה מלא. וכן: אַדְמוֹנִי
ראיתי בתיקון ס"ת

Gen. 26.25: בתיקון סת וגם בספרי מדוייקי ראיתי: אהלו. אָהֱלָה:
בו. אבל בעל המסר אומר אהלה. בה"א. ויש
חילוק גם במסר. שיש קצת ספרי שאינם מונין
זה בחשבון

Gen. 46.3: ובתיקון סופרים ראיתי: מרדה מצרים. מְרָדָה מִצְרַיִם:
אבל בעל המסר אומר: מרדה
מצרימה

Jer. 21.6: ל. ובקצת ספרי כתי: את האדם. וטעות. כי: וְאֵת הָאָדָם:
הוא נמנה במסר רבת עם אותם ואת. דלית
להון זוגא

Ezek. 22.18: בהרבה ספרים הוא בזקף. וטעות. כי אינו: בֶּן אָדָם
ממנין הל"א שמונה המסרה בטע זקף

Ezek. 39.28: יפה וכך דינו. כי לא נמנה במסר כי אם: אֶל אֲדָמָתָם
ד על אדמתם בסיפ. וזה לא נמנה
בכללם. ומטעי ביה ספרי

Ezek. 45.10: כן דינו. כי בקצת ספרי מצאתיו: יהיה. ובמקצת: יִהְיֶה
יהי. וטעות. כי לא נמנה עם אותם דחס ה בסוף
תיבות וקרי. אלא דינו: יהי הכתיב והקרי

Ps. 88.10: ג. וראיתי בספר מדוייק כתוב: בכל עת. :בְּכָל יוֹם
ולולי המסורה הייתי מגיה כך

Ps. 144.2: רש"י פי כי בספר מוגה ועליו מסורה שהיה לו. :תִּחְתִּי
היה כתוב תחתי. וקרי תחתיו. ונ"ל כי הוא טעות.
שבמסר רבת לא נמנו כי אם י"ב חס וי"ו בסוף
תיבות וקריין. ובדקתי בד ובה ספרי מסר ואין
מונים כי אם י"ב. וזה לא נמנה עמהם

Prov. 4.15: בקצת ספרי כתו יעבור. וקרי ועבור. אמנם לפי: וַעֲבֹר
דעת בעלי המסרה לא יתכן. כי לא נמנו כי
אם כב דכתי יו"ד בריש תיבות וקרי וי"ו. וזה
לא נמנה עמהם

Ex. 14.25: ככ בקמ. כי לא נמנה במסור במספר הי"ב פתחי: נִלְחָם
יש ספרי מוגה בהם: וממטה ראובן את בצר וגו ובכל: Josh. 21.35
הספ המדוייקים הישנים לא נמצא. ועיין בפי הקמחי.
וגם במסר עיין. כי כשמונה כ"ח את. לא נמצא בכללן.
וזה ראייה גדולה

The only instances I am aware of, in which Jacob ben Chayim wittingly deviates from what he considers to be implied by the Masora, are the two following passages, in one of which he yields to the authority of Kimḥi:

Gen. 16.12: כן בכל הספרים. אבל לפי המסורה לא יכול: וְעַל פְּנֵי
להיות ובתיקון ס"ת ראיתי: על פני

Ezek. 43.26: יכפרו ק. אמנם בקצת ספרים מדוייקים ישני: וְכִפְּרוּ:
מצאתי שהכת והקרי: יכפרו. וגם המסרה
מוכחת כן. כי לא נמנה עם אות שהם כתובים
וי"ו בריש תיבות וקרי יו"ד. לולי שראיתי
לרד"ק בפירושו שאמר: שהכת וכפרו. והקרי
יכפרו.

§ 22. *The Selecting of a Reading in the Absence of Masora*

In all of those numerous cases, in which Jacob ben Chayim found himself confronted with the problem of selecting his reading among the variants offered in the source-manuscripts which he consulted, and where no Masoretic note was at hand to guide him in his choice, he seems not to have followed any fixed rules as to which manuscript deserves greater credence in every detail, but decided each case on its own merits, according to his judgment. In a note he records the variant reading which he rejected:

Ex. 19.4: חלוקים הספרים. ויש הרבה ספרי: במצרים. לְמִצְרַיִם
ובספרים מדוייקי גם בקצת סת מדוייקים
נמצא: למצרים

Ezek. 29.2: כן דינו לדעת הקמחי. ובספרים מדוייקים ישנים: כָּלָה
מצאתי כתו כלה בחולם

1 Ki. 20.20: וינס ארם בספרים מדוייקים וישנים: וַיִּנְסוּ אֲרָם

Josh. 24.26: ל חס. ובסא מדוייק מלא: וַיִּקְמָה

1 Sam. 23.4: בקצת ספרים חס. ובס מוגה מל: קַעֲלָה

Jer. 22.2: סא שמעו. ובס מוגה: שִׁמְעָה

Job 15.17: בספ מוגה דגש: אַחֲזֶקֶת

Judg. 9.35: כן בספ מוגה: הַמֶּאֱרָב

Jer. 9.22: כן בספ מוגה: (3°) אַל

Jer. 13.7: כן בספ מוגה: לא

Jer. 51.46: כן בספ מוגה: (1°) מַשֵּׁל

Ezek. 46.6: כן בסיפ מוגה ויפה: בְּקָר תְּמִימִם

Ps. 109.18: כן בספ מוגה: וְהִשְׁמָן

In these cases Jacob ben Chayim decided according to the evidence of the ספר מוגה; but in other instances he rejected this evidence:

Isa. 15.2: בספ מוגה: וְדִיבֹן כְּתִי

Jer. 44.8: בספר מוגה: לָהֶם: לָכֶם

Ezek. 14.23: בספר מוגה: לָהּ: בָּהּ

Job 9.8: ובספר מוגה: בַּמָּתִי עַב: בְּמָתִי יָם

Josh. 19.34: סא מוגה: אֲזֵנוּ: אֲזֵנוֹת

Josh. 9.21: סא ישן מצאתיו מוגה: אֱלֹהִים: לָהֶם

Josh. 19.15: ל. סא ויראלה בריש: וַיִּדְאֶלָּה

Isa. 34.16: סא ואשה: אִשָּׁה

Jer. 6.27: סא לבם: דִּרְכָם

Jer. 9.15: סא ידעום: יָדְעוּ

Jer. 14.14: סא לכם: לָהֶם

Jer. 24.1: (למדנחאי צדקיה: צִדְקִיָּהוּ cf. § 18 d β) סא יכניהו: יִכְנְיָה

Ezek. 23.5: סא וַחֲעֻב: וַחֲעֻב

Ezek. 36.4: ל. סא השממות: הַשְּׁמֹמֹת

Isa. 51.5: סא חס: זָרוּעִי

Josh. 8.21: מצאנו בספר ישן: הָעִיר: הָעֵי

Isa. 63.15: ברוב הספרים חס: מִזְבֹּל

Ezek. 40.4: ל וככ. ובקצת ספרי חס ה בחר: הַבְּאֵתָה

Gen. 36.7: יש ספרים חסר: רְכוּשָׁם

Isa. 27.4: ל. ויס שי"ן בחטף קמץ: אֶפְשָׁעָה

1 Sam. 25.22: יש ספרים: אור: עַד הַבֶּקֶר

כ ספר ירוש. ובסא נמצא: וְאֵל אֶלְעָזָר: וְאֵל אֶלְעָזָר

E. CONCLUSIONS

XI. HOW TO EDIT THE BIBLE

§ 23. *The Problem*

1. The Hebrew Bible is the basic source for our knowledge of Hebrew grammar. In this relationship between Bible and grammar, the Bible occupies the first place, being of primary importance, while the grammar can best be described by the Talmudic term of a *תולדה דידה* (an offspring thereof). Thus, a reliable Bible text is an indispensable prerequisite for all grammatical researches; but on the other hand: no grammatical theories must be permitted to influence in any way the shaping of the Bible text. For else, the grammar based upon such a Bible text would merely demonstrate to what extent our own preconceived grammatical theories were actually applied in the editing of the aforesaid Bible, instead of revealing any genuinely Hebrew grammatical laws.

2. It is lamentable that this fundamental consideration has obviously not been the guiding principle of the Bible editions hitherto published:

a) The Bible editions which at present are in common use, as those published by S. Baer, C. D. Ginsburg, R. Kittel (first and second edition of his *Biblia Hebraica*) and M. Letteris, are based upon Jacob ben Chayim's first Masoretic Bible. Though they claim to be faithful reproductions thereof, they very frequently changed the vocalization in its many aspects (cf. HPh § 7) as well as the accentuation, so as to make their text the better conform with what they considered "correct" Hebrew grammar, but which we would more adequately term as *their* respective conception of Hebrew grammar. The many differences which exist between these editions — all of which claim to be

carefully revised according to the Masora reflect solely the corresponding differences in the grammatical views held by the respective editors. Cf. the post-script of the "*Neu revidirte und verbesserte*" Bible edition, published in **מנצא תרנ"ד** under the auspices of the Jewish Orthodox Bible Institute in Germany, which reads: **הוגה על פי המראה אשר ראיתי בספרי דפוס קדמונים** ועל משפט דקדוק הלשון. It goes without saying that our scientific Hebrew grammars, being based upon one or the other of these Bible editions, are basically valueless.

b) Jacob ben Chayim's Bible is, according to his own statement in his *Introduction*, a revision of the then extant Bible texts: **ואחר שראיתי בספרי המסרה והתבוננתי בהם. ראיתים מבולבלים בתכלית ומשובשים. עד שאין בהם בית אשר אין שם מת... וכשראיתי כל זה... הייתי מתקנם על נכון. ובמקומות שמצאתי הפרש בין ספרי המסרה: זה אומר בכה וזה אומר בכה. הבאתי דעות שניהם... ובמקומות שהיה קשה לי על לשון ספר אחד מהמסרה. שלא הייתי מוצא כדבריו ברוב הספרים. ובמסרה אחרת באופן אחר. ולא היה קשה. ובמקומות שהיה קשה מדידיה אדידיה... הייתי חוקר עד שהייתי מוצא האמת לעניות דעתי... והשם יודע כמה טורח עבדתי על זה** In establishing his text, Jacob ben Chayim proceeded according to what might be called the eclectic method — provided we consent to call his procedure a method. Thus, some times he follows Ben Naftali, but on some other occasions he gives Ben Asher the preference; on two occasions he refers to Spanish codices as **שאנו נסמכין עליהם**, but elsewhere he frequently adopts the reading found in **ברוב הספרים** as against that of **במקצת ספרים**. Jacob ben Chayim thus used his own judgment in choosing one and discarding another reading.

c) Amongst the many authorities, which Jacob ben Chayim quotes by name in order either to accept or to reject their readings, Ben Asher and Ben Naftali rank very high as Masoretic

scholars. But even their work as editors of the Bible was of the same type as has just been characterized for the later generations, namely: basing their editions on preconceived grammatical theories. At least for Ben Asher's work we have explicit evidence for this rôle of his, in a colophon to ms. Adler 1701 of our Seminary Library, which reads: **הכל על תקון הספר הידוע במצרים. שהוא כולל כד ספרים. שהגיהן בן אשר ודקדק בן אשר שנים רבות**. In other words: The fame of the well-known Egyptian codex (**הספר הידוע במצרים**) rests on the fact that Ben Asher spent many years of his life (**שנים רבות**) in correcting it (**שהגיהן**) and revising every detail (**ודקדק**). By this procedure, an otherwise common Bible ms. became an authoritative Model Code. But in order to correct and carefully revise the ms., Ben Asher must have worked out beforehand his own grammatical laws as to what is correct in Hebrew, and what is not. These laws he then painstakingly applied to the ms., which thus became a Model Codex, since Ben Asher's reputation as a grammarian imbued it with authority. But the relationship between Bible and grammar was thus reversed: for the Bible of Ben Asher was an offspring of his grammar!

3. Thus, Bible editors till now made the fundamental error to approach their task as grammarians, anxious to eliminate and correct what in their eyes plainly were "errors." By this procedure they achieved that grammatical studies finally became hopelessly entangled in inner contradictions, resulting from the attempts to put on a common denominator different Hebrew forms, which in reality represent the remnants of the many hands which had been at work editing the Bible throughout the generations. These problems will be dealt with in detail in my forthcoming Hebrew Grammar.

4. In order to free ourselves from these many layers of editorial débris, we have to search for such Bible texts, the

readings of which do not exhibit systematic revisions of this kind. We emphasize: "systematic" revisions; because it would be too much to hope to find texts which entirely escaped such editorial changes. But inconsistency in their application will permit us to arrive at general conclusions as to the characteristics of their genuine *Vorlage*. We, therefore, turn to *incunabula* and old Bible manuscripts, which up to now have been entirely disregarded by grammarians and Bible editors alike, since the text they present was considered utterly incorrect.

§ 24. *The Basic Bible Text*

As specimina for our new approach we first publish, both in facsimile reproduction and in transcription, two pages from the famous *Codex Reuchlinianus* (written in 1105) in Karlsruhe, and one page from a very rare *Spanish incunabulum* of our Seminary Library. The facsimiles from the *Codex Reuchlinianus* are taken from Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. I (1887), and William Wright, *Facsimiles of Manuscripts and Inscriptions*, vol. II (1883), respectively.

The transcription aims at faithfully reproducing all the details of the vocalization. However, a few external changes in the position of certain vowel-signs in the *Codex Reuchlinianus* had to be introduced in order to simplify their reproduction in print. Thus, we indicate *ḵameṣ* here by **ⴐ**, while the Ms. has **ⴑ**; **ל** in final position is vocalized **ֿל** in the Ms., but here **לֿ**; instead of **ֿל** and **ֿל** of the Ms. we print **ֿל** and **ֿל**, respectively; the *dagesh* in **נ** and **ך** we put above these letters: **נֿ** and **ךֿ**, instead of **נ** and **ך**, as the Ms. presents.

Codex Reuchlinianus

(Landesbibliothek, Karlsruhe)

fol. 83b

1 Sam. 30.27–31.9

27: לְאִשָּׁר בְּבִיתֵאל וְלְאִשָּׁר בְּרָמָת נֹגֵב וְלְאִשָּׁר בִּיתִיר:
 28: וְלְאִשָּׁר בְּעֶרְעֵר וְלְאִשָּׁר בְּשַׁפְמוֹת וְלְאִשָּׁר בְּאַשְׁתִּמֶע:
 29: וְלְאִשָּׁר בְּרָכָל וְלְאִשָּׁר בְּעָרִי הִירְחֵמָאֵלִי וְלְאִשָּׁר בְּעָרִי
 הַקִּנִּי:

30: וְלְאִשָּׁר בְּחֶרְמָה וְלְאִשָּׁר בְּבֵר עֶשֶׂן וְלְאִשָּׁר בְּעֶתֶד:
 31: וְלְאִשָּׁר בְּחֶבְרוֹן וְלִכָּל הַמְּקוֹמוֹת אֲשֶׁר הִתְהַלֵּךְ שָׁם דָּוִד
 הוּא וְאֲנָשָׁיו:

1: וּפְלִשְׁתִּים נִלְחָמִים בִּישְׂרָאֵל וַיָּנֹסוּ אָנָשִׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִפְּנֵי
 פְּלִשְׁתִּים וַיִּפְּלוּ חֲלָלִים בְּהָר הַגִּלְבָּע:
 2: וַיִּדְּבְקוּ פְּלִשְׁתִּים אֶת שְׂאוֹל וְאֶת בָּנָיו וַיִּכּוּ פְּלִשְׁתִּים אֶת
 יְהוֹנָתָן וְאֶת אַבְיָתָר וְאֶת מֶלְכִישׁוּעַ בֶּן־יִשָּׁאֵל:
 3: וַתִּכְבֹּד הַמֶּלֶךְמָה עַל שְׂאוֹל וַיִּמָּצְאוּהוּ הַמּוֹרִים אֲנָשִׁים
 בִּקְשֵׁת וַיַּחַל מְאֹד מִהַמּוֹרִים:
 4: וַיֹּאמֶר שְׂאוֹל לְנִשְׂאָ כָלִין שְׁלֵף חֶרֶבְךָ וַדְּקֹרֵנִי בָּהּ פֶּן
 יָבֹאוּ הָעֶרְלִים הָאֵלֶּה וַדְּקֹרֵנִי וְהִתְעַלְלוּ בִּי וְלֹא אָבָה
 נִשְׂאָ כָלִין כִּי יָרָא מְאֹד וַיִּקַּח שְׂאוֹל אֶת הַחֶרֶב וַיַּפֵּל
 עָלֶיהָ:

5: וַיֵּרָא נָשָׂא כָלִין כִּי מָת שְׂאוּל וַיִּפֹּל גַּם הוּא עַל חֻרְבוֹ
וַיָּמָת עִמּוֹ:

6: וַיָּמָת שְׂאוּל וּשְׁלֵשֶׁת בָּנָיו וְנָשָׂא כָלִין וְגַם כָּל אֲנָשָׁיו בְּיוֹם
הַהוּא יָחַד:

7: וַיֵּרְאוּ אֲנָשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר בְּעֶבֶר הָעֵמֶק וְאֲשֶׁר בְּעֶבֶר
הַיַּרְדֵּן כִּי נָסוּ אֲנָשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְכִי מָתוּ שְׂאוּל וּבָנָיו וַיַּעֲזְבוּ
אֶת הָעָרִים וַיָּנוּסוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ פְּלִשְׁתִּים וַיֵּשְׁבוּ בָהֶן:

8: וַיְהִי מִמַּחֲרָת וַיָּבֹאוּ פְּלִשְׁתִּים לְפָשֵׁט אֶת הַחֲלָלִים וַיִּמָּצְאוּ
אֶת שְׂאוּל וְאֶת שְׁלֵשֶׁת בָּנָיו נִפְּלִים בְּהָר הַגִּלְבָּע:
9: וַיִּכְרְתוּ אֶת רֹאשׁוֹ וַיִּפְּשִׁיטוּ אֶת כָּלָיו וַיִּשְׁלְחוּ בָאָרֶץ
פְּלִשְׁתִּים סָבִיב לַבָּשָׂר בֵּית עֶצְבִּיהֶם וְאֶת הָעַם:

fol. 382b

Mal. 3.19–24:

19: כִּי הִנֵּה הַיּוֹם בָּא בְּעָר כְּתָנוּר וְהָיוּ כָּל יָדַיִם וְכָל עֲשֵׂי
רְשָׁעָה קָשׁ וְלֹהֵט אֲתָם הַיּוֹם הַבֹּא אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת
אֲשֶׁר לֹא יַעֲזֹב לָהֶם שָׂרֵשׁ וְעִנְיָה:

20: וְהָרַחֵה לָכֶם יְרֵאִי שְׁמִי שְׂמֵשׁ צִדְקָה וּמִרְפֵּא בְכַנְפֶיהָ
וַיִּצְאֲתֶם וּפְשַׁתֶּם כְּעִנְלֵי מִרְבֵּק:

21: וַעֲשׂוּתֶם רְשָׁעִים כִּי יִהְיוּ אֶפְרַת תַּחַת כְּפוֹת רִגְלֵיכֶם בְּיוֹם
אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת:

22: זָכְרוּ תוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה עַבְדִּי אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי אֹתוֹ בְּחֵרֵב עַל כָּל
יִשְׂרָאֵל הַקִּים וּמִשְׁפָּטִים:

23: הִנֵּה אֲנֹכִי שֹׁלַח לָכֶם אֶת אֱלֹהֵי הַנְּבִיא לִפְנֵי בֹא יוֹם יְהוָה
הַגָּדוֹל וְהַנּוֹרָא:

24: וְהָשִׁיב לֵב אֲבוֹתַי עַל בְּנֵים וְלֵב בְּנֵים עַל אֲבוֹתָם פֶּן אָבוּא
וְהִכִּיתִי אֶת הָאָרֶץ חָרָם:
23: הִנֵּה אֲנֹכִי שֹׁלַח לָכֶם

Pentateuch with Targum

Spanish Incunabulum (Library, Jewish Theological Seminary,
shelf mark 72050)

Deut. 29.2–19

הַגְדִּילִים הָהֵם:

3: וְלֹא נָתַן יְהוָה לָכֶם לֵב לְדַעַת וְעֵינַיִם לִרְאוֹת וְאָזְנוֹת
לִשְׁמֹעַ עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה:

4: וְאוּלַּךְ אֲתָכֶם אַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה בְּמִדְבָּר לֹא בָלוּ שְׁלֹמֹתֵיכֶם
מֵעֲלִיכֶם וְנִעְלִיף לֹא בָלְתָה מֵעַל רַגְלֵיךָ:

5: לֶחֶם לֹא אָכַלְתֶּם וַיֵּין וְשִׁכָּר לֹא שְׁתִּיתֶם לְמַעַן תִּדְעוּ כִּי
אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם:

- 6: וַתְּבֹאוּ אֶל הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה וַיֵּצֵא סִיחֹן מֶלֶךְ חֲשָׁבוֹן וְעוֹג מֶלֶךְ
הַבָּשָׁן לִקְרֹאתָנוּ לְמַלְחָמָה וְנִכְסֵם:
- 7: וַנִּקַּח אֶת אֶרֶצָם וְנִתְּנָה לְנַחֲלָה לְרֵאוּבֵנִי וּלְגָדִי וּלְחֻצֵי
שִׁבְטֵי הַמְּנַשִּׁי:
- 8: וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת דְּבָרֵי הַבְּרִית הַזֹּאת וַעֲשִׂיתֶם אִתָּם לְמַעַן
תִּשְׁכִּילוּ אֵת כָּל אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשׂוּן:
- 9: אַתֶּם נֹצְבִים הַיּוֹם כָּלְכֶם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם רְאִשִׁיכֶם
שְׁבֻטֵיכֶם וְקִנִּיכֶם וּשְׁטָרֵיכֶם כָּל אִישׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל:
- 10: טַפְכֶם נְשִׁיכֶם וְגֵרְךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּקֶרֶב מַחֲנֶיךָ מַחֲטָב עֲצִיף עַד
שֹׂאב מִמֶּיךָ:
- 11: לְעִבְרְךָ בַּבְּרִית יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ וּבְאֵלֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
כָּרַת עִמָּךְ הַיּוֹם:
- 12: לְמַעַן הִקִּים־אֹתָךְ הַיּוֹם לוֹ לְעַם וְהוּא־יְהִי לָךְ לְאֱלֹהִים
כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר־לָךְ וּכְאֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע לְאַבְרָהָם לְאִצְחָק וּלְיַעֲקֹב:
- 13: וְלֹא אִתְּכֶם לְבִדְכֶם אֲנֹכִי כָרַת אֶת־הַבְּרִית הַזֹּאת וְאֶת־
הָאֱלֹהִים הַזֹּאת:
- 14: כִּי אֶת־אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁנוּ פֹה עָמְנוּ עִמָּד הַיּוֹם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
וְאֶת אֲשֶׁר־אֵינָנו פֹּה עָמְנוּ הַיּוֹם:
- 15: כִּי־אַתֶּם יָדַעְתֶּם אֶת־אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁבְּנוּ בָאָרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וְאֶת־
אֲשֶׁר עָבְרָנוּ בְּקֶרֶב הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר עָבְרָתֶם:

16: וַתֵּרְאוּ אֶת שְׁקוּצֵיהֶם וְאֶת־גִּלְלֵיהֶם עַץ וְאֶבֶן כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב

אֲשֶׁר עִמָּהֶם:

17: פֶּן־יֵשׁ בְּכֶם אִישׁ אוֹ אִשָּׁה אוֹ מְשֻׁפָּחָה אוֹ שֶׁבֶט אֲשֶׁר לִבּוֹ

פָּנָה הַיּוֹם מֵעַם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ לָלֶכֶת לַעֲבֹד אֶת־אֱלֹהֵי

הַגּוֹיִם הָהֵם פֶּן יֵשׁ בְּכֶם שֶׁרֶשׁ פָּרָה רֹאשׁ וְלַעֲנָה:

18: וְהָיָה בְּשִׁמְעוֹ אֶת דְּבָרֵי הָאֱלֹהִים הַזֹּאת וְהִתְבָּרַךְ בְּלִבּוֹ

לֵאמֹר שְׁלוֹם יְהוָה לִי כִּי בִשְׂרָרוֹת לְבִי אֵלַי לְמַעַן

סִפּוֹת הָרָוָה אֶת־הַצִּמְאָה:

19: לֹא־יֵאָבֵד יְהוָה סֵלַח לוֹ כִּי־אָז וְקִנְאָתוֹ

בְּאִישׁ הַהוּא וּרְבִצָּה־בּוֹ כָּל הָאֱלֹהִים וּמָחָה יְהוָה

אֶת־שְׁמוֹ מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם:

§ 25. *The Significance of these Specimens*

a) In order to fully appreciate the importance of these texts for Hebrew grammar, it is essential that we free ourselves from the established grammatical views as expressed in the current works on this subject. For it is not our aim to compare the vocalization of any given word in these texts with that of the so-called Masoretic text and note deviations. Such an approach would imply our silent admission of the validity of the Masoretic grammatical laws even for our texts, though they may not have been punctiliously enough observed here. We on the other hand decline to commit ourselves *a priori* neither to admitting, nor to denying it. Solely the way how the vowel-signs are applied in the texts themselves, shall decide this problem (cf. HPh § 9).

1. The *Codex Reuchlinianus* applies *dagesh* indiscriminately to almost all the letters of the alphabet (the sole exceptions being ן and ף), regardless of the position of the letter (whether at the beginning, in the middle or at the end of a word) and of the nature of the preceding vowel-sign (whether ֿ or ֿ; ֿ or ֿ; ֿ or ֿ). Those letters of a word, which for no apparent reason at all have no *dagesh*, get a *raphe* instead. But neither *α) dagesh* nor *β) raphe* follow any rules; they are irregularly put:

1 Sam. 31.8: וְאֵת
9: וְאֵת
Mal. 3.19: כָּל
22: כָּל

δ) 1 Sam. 31.6: שָׂאוֹל Mal. 3.23: הַנְּבִיא

Gen. 41.4: וְהִבְרִיאתָ
הִבְרִיאתָ 20:
הַפְּרוֹת Gen. 41.4:
(2°) הַפְּרוֹת 20:

β) Gen. 41.37: עֲבָדָיו	Deut. 30.2: אֱלֹהֶיךָ
38: עֲבָדָיו	אֱלֹהֶיךָ 1:
Deut. 29.4: (לא) בָּלוּ	Deut. 29.13: הִזָּאת (1°)
" (לא) בָּלְתָה:	" הִזָּאת: (2°)

c) the vowel *a* is indicated by the indiscriminate use of , and _ :

1. in the *Codex Reuchlinianus*:

1 Sam. 31.3: הַמֹּרִים	1 Sam. 30.31: וְאֲנָשִׁין
" מִהַמֹּרִים:	" 31.6: אֲנָשִׁין
1 Sam. 31.1: הַגִּלְבָּעַ	1 Sam. 31.5: גַּם
8: הַגִּלְבָּעַ	וְגַם 6:
1 Sam. 31.1: יִשְׂרָאֵל	Mal. 3.23: אֲנֹכִי
Mal. 3.22: יִשְׂרָאֵל	" אֲנֹכִי

2. in the *Spanish incunabulum*:

Gen. 41.5: שֶׁבַע	Gen. 41.14: פְּרָעָה
6: שֶׁבַע	16: פְּרָעָה
Gen. 41.18: בָּשָׂר	Gen. 41.4: הַפְּרוֹת
19: בָּשָׂר	20: הַפְּרוֹת (1°)
Gen. 41.21: קִרְבָּנָה (1°)	Gen. 41.17: בַּחֲלָמִי
" קִרְבָּנָה (2°)	22: בַּחֲלָמִי
Gen. 41.31: הַשֶּׁבַע	Gen. 41.35: כָּל
34: הַשֶּׁבַע	37: כָּל
Deut. 29.11: הַיּוֹם	Deut. 30.3: אֱלֹהֶיךָ (1°)
12: הַיּוֹם	" אֱלֹהֶיךָ: (2°)
	Deut. 29.22: יִהְיֶה
	" 30.1: יִהְיֶה

d) similarly $_$ and $_$ are interchangeably used:

1. in the *Codex Reuchlinianus*:

1 Sam. 31.4: כָּלִין (1°)	Mal. 3.19: אֲשֶׁר
“ : כָּלִין (2°)	22: אֲשֶׁר

2. in the *Spanish incunabulum*:

Gen. 41.26: הִנֵּה	Lev. 11.4: נָרָה
27: הִנֵּה	5: נָרָה
Deut. 29.26: הִנֵּה	
27: הִנֵּה	

e) The material at our disposal, especially from the so highly important *Codex Reuchlinianus*, is very limited; the two pages which form the basis for our discussion are all we possess. There are abundant indications that an examination of the entire ms. would reveal startling results; cf. e. g. 1) the absence of *pataḥ furtivum* as evidenced by forms like בְּאֶשְׁתִּמֶּעַ, הִנָּלְבַע, מִלְכִּישׁוּעַ, שִׁלָּה (bis); 2) the vocalization of *waw* in final position with *shewa*, as f. i.: כָּלִין, בְּנִין, יַחֲדוֹ, אֲנָשִׁין; 3) the fact that *holem* is affixed to the consonant to which it belongs, and not to the following *mater lectionis waw*, thus resulting in a two-ways vocalization of the word: first by the *mater lectionis waw* (cf. HPT § 40), and subsequently by *holem*, e. g. הַמְקוֹמוֹת; כְּפוֹת, הַיּוֹם, הַמּוֹרִים. But these details will have to wait for their clarification until normal peace conditions return, and the contents of European libraries will again be made accessible to Americans.

§ 26. Towards a New Bible Edition

The results at which we arrived in the foregoing paragraph, incomplete though they are due to the scarcity of material, are of the utmost importance for the New Edition of the Hebrew

Bible, which we plan to publish. No matter whether we adopt the procedure of the *Codex Reuchlinianus* and use *dagesh* indiscriminately throughout, or whether we follow the lead of the *Spanish incunabulum* and put the *dagesh* into the discard altogether, the final outcome remains the same: the *dagesh* has outlived its existence! It ceases to be a *dagesh*, i. e. a *crux grammaticarum* (cf. HPh §§ 11–35), and is reduced to its original insignificance of a mere dot, inserted at random in curved letters for the sole purpose of their beautification.

Since , and . are promiscuously used, and there is not the slightest semblance of evidence that they were meant to indicate two distinct vowels, there could be no objection from the scholarly point of view to simplify matters by substituting one single vowel-sign for both of them. The same procedure is herewith advocated with regard to , and ., which are used interchangeably, too.

I emphasize: these are merely temporary and incomplete results; and a thorough examination of the hitherto neglected “incorrect” manuscripts in the old European libraries will no doubt round up and bring to a conclusion this *tendency towards simplification*, which is based solely on a careful study and an unbiased interpretation of old texts, the soundest bases a philologist can think of. In conclusion I wish to state that the results outlined here fully substantiate the “General Conclusions” (HPh, chapter C), which were formulated after an examination of the laws of Masoretic Hebrew Phonology, and at a time, when the basic texts of this investigation here still were *terra incognita* to me.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES

Numbers in brackets [] refer to pagination in brackets

GENESIS		EXODUS	
	27.33 [70]		10.11 [69]
	27.39 [69]		10.12 [85]
1.10 [70]	27.46 [68]	4.12 [80]	11.4 [97]
1.31 [41]	31.52 [65]	7.12 [77]	11.5 [97]
2.14 [65]	32.12 [65]	9.4 [64]	11.42 [24]
3.17 [58]	32.27 [69]	12.37 [41]	13.9 [56]
3.21 [41]	33.4 [38], [66]	13.2 [69]	13.33 [30], [68]
3.24 [58], [68]	33.5 [70]	13.16 [26]	13.45 [76]
5.7 [68]	35.5 [65]	14.14 [57]	14.4 [74]
9.21 [71]	36.5 [41]	14.25 [83]	14.6 [63], [75]
11.32 [65]	36.7 [80], [85]	15.2 [58]	14.10 [41]
13.9 [65]	36.12 [41]	15.11 [69], [76]	14.37 [74]
16.5 [37]	36.14 [41]	16.7 [57]	14.51 [63], [77]
16.12 [84]	37.12 [38]	16.12 [66]	15.19 [76]
16.13 [69]	41.4 [95]	16.13 [80]	16.13 [69]
17.12 [69]	41.5 [95], [96]	17.16 [58]	16.21 [71]
17.20 [62], [74]	41.6 [95], [96]	18.20 [77]	18.15 [69]
17.24 [65]	41.14 [96]	19.4 [84]	21.6 [73]
18.5 [66]	41.16 [96]	19.9 [31]	21.21 [73]
18.9 [37]	41.17 [96]	19.13 [57]	22.16 [58]
18.15 [79]	41.18 [96]	21.19 [79]	23.17 [65], [74]
18.21 [41]	41.19 [96]	21.29 [66]	23.42 [65]
18.22 [66]	41.20 [95]	22.19 [76]	23.43 [58]
18.33 [68]	41.21 [96]	22.26 [71]	25.45 [77]
19.13 [78]	41.22 [96]	26.5 [80]	27.13 [74]
19.22 [68]	41.26 [97]	27.16 [58]	
19.33 [37]	41.27 [97]	28.20 [77]	
20.11 [77]	41.31 [96]	28.28 [70]	
23.16 [65]	41.34 [96]	30.23 [69]	
24.10 [77]	41.35 [96]	32.10 [77]	
24.19 [69]	41.37 [96]	32.11 [32]	
24.23 [66]	41.38 [96]	32.19 [72]	
24.49 [65]	41.43 [69]	32.25 [76]	
25.6 [28]	41.57 [70]	35.34 [69]	
25.14 [78]	43.12 [70]	38.18 [77]	
25.16 [74]	43.15 [41]		
25.25 [82]	46.3 [82]		
25.33 [41]	46.8 [41]		
26.6 [66]	47.19 [70]		
26.22 [80]	48.7 [41]		
26.25 [82]	49.7 [66]		
26.35 [79]	49.20 [65]		
27.2 [41]	49.21 [80]		
27.3 [78]	50.9 [55]		
27.27 [41]			
		LEVITICUS	
		4.25 [25]	
		4.30 [25]	
		4.34 [25], [41]	
		4.35 [79]	
		5.16 [74]	
		5.19 [70]	
		8.8 [30]	
		9.22 [72]	
			NUMBERS
			3.39 [38]
			4.3 [41]
			5.7 [70]
			5.27 [79]
			6.5 [62]
			7.1 [29]
			7.10 [62]
			7.20 [56]
			7.60 [64]
			7.85 [79]
			9.10 [38]
			10.9 [70]
			14.27 [66]
			21.30 [38]
			23.10 [70]
			23.19 [64]
			25.12 [68]

28.19 [32]	14.11 [65]	28.6 [77]	23.21 [13]
28.21 [38]	15.48 [72]	28.8 [60]	23.35 [15]
29.15 [38], [66]	17.18 [55]	29.3 [69]	23.37 [13]
32.42 [58]	18.20 [72]	30.27	24.14 [13]
36.1 [41]	19.8 [68]	30.28	24.22 [13]
36.8 [66]	19.15 [85]	30.31 [95], [96]	
	19.34 [85]	31.1 [96]	1 KINGS
DEUTERONOMY	19.49 [68]	31.3 [96]	
1.26 [41]	21.11 [80]	31.4 [95], [97]	1.27 [71]
1.32 [74], [78]	21.32 [73]	31.5 [95], [96]	3.6 [70]
3.20 [42]	21.35 [83]	31.6 [95], [96]	3.12 [79]
4.13 [74]	22.27 [74]	31.7 [95]	3.20 [79]
5.10 [69]	24.26 [84]	31.8 [95], [96]	4.11 [73]
6.8 [26]		31.9 [95]	6.38 [71]
6.9 [29]	JUDGES		7.2 [74]
10.12 [28]	1.3 [68]	2 SAMUEL	7.23 [13], [72]
10.18 [69]	5.18 [64]		7.36 [64]
11.18 [26]	9.12 [60]	2.5/6 [65]	8.18 [73]
17.8 [74]	9.35 [84]	2.12 [77]	8.26 [13]
22.6 [42]	9.37 [68]	3.35 [22]	8.34 [76]
23.24 [66]	10.6 [80]	5.2 [12]	8.48 [13]
28.59 [64]	12.4 [55]	5.11 [15]	9.9 [14]
29.4 [96]	15.20 [27]	5.19 [15]	9.18 [14]
29.11 [96]	16.5 [59]	5.24 [12]	9.25 [73]
29.12 [96]	16.31 [27]	6.23 [70], [79]	10.1 [69]
29.13 [96]	19.11 [59]	7.10 [23]	10.5 [14]
29.22 [96]	19.17 [80]	7.18 [67], [77]	10.25 [69]
29.26 [97]	21.19 [73]	8.3 [9]	12.3 [14]
29.27 [97]		8.10 [15]	12.7 [14]
29.28 [38]	1 SAMUEL	9.4 [72], [73]	12.12 [14]
30.1 [96]	1.3 [79]	10.9 [15]	12.21 [14]
30.2 [96]	1.20 [74]	11.1 [73]	12.27 [77]
30.3 [96]	1.28 [80]	11.24 [73]	14.2 [72]
31.16 [66]	2.24 [27]	12.1 [61], [73]	14.25 [14]
32.4 [68]	3.21 [73]	13.33 [22]	16.1 [79]
32.6 [68], [78]	4.7 [68]	14.21 [80]	16.24 [69]
32.25 [42]	4.18 [28]	15.21 [22]	18.36 [70]
32.35 [72]	13.19 [56]	15.27 [76]	20.20 [84]
32.47 [78]	17.24 [77]	17.14 [80]	20.31 [67]
	18.5 [55]	19.6 [67]	21.9 [73]
JOSHUA	18.10 [56]	19.7 [55]	21.12 [73]
2.15 [58]	18.22 [71]	19.42 [77]	22.8 [15]
2.16 [67]	19.22 [73]	21.21 [12]	22.13 [14], [70]
3.4 [72]	20.13 [74]	22.30 [76]	22.34 [15]
3.5 [58]	20.29 [56]	23.8 [12]	2 KINGS
6.3 [73]	23.4 [84]	23.9 [12], [13]	
8.12 [80]	24.19 [72]	23.13 [13]	4.44 [74]
8.21 [85]	25.22 [85]	23.15 [13], [71]	5.18 [21]
9.21 [85]	26.21 [63]	23.16 [13], [71]	8.17 [14]
11.16 [72]	26.23 [65]	23.18 [13], [15]	8.26 [28]
		23.20 [13]	10.5 [57]

11.1 [14]	27.6 [54]	5.7 [51]	49.28 [69]
11.2 [14]	27.12 [69]	5.22 [45], [76]	49.30 [54]
11.4 [14]	28.2 [49]	6.19 [80]	51.3 [22]
11.10 [14]	28.15 [52]	6.20 [74]	51.46 [85]
11.15 [14]	28.28 [62], [69]	6.27 [85]	
11.18 [14]	30.5 [52], [73]	7.32 [42]	
14.2 [14]	31.4 [80]	8.1 [50]	EZEKIEL
14.8 [15]	32.14 [70]	8.5 [68]	
14.12 [14]	34.16 [85]	8.6 [53]	3.17 [76]
14.13 [72]	37.24 [16]	8.9 [68]	5.11 [74]
15.5 [16]	37.30 [16]	9.15 [85]	5.13 [55]
16.17 [60]	37.32 [16]	9.22 [85]	7.22 [69]
18.31 [56]	37.38 [16]	10.8 [48]	8.6 [76]
19.23 [16]	38.14 [81]	12.3 [64]	11.6 [46]
19.29 [16]	39.2 [17]	13.2 [49], [50]	13.20 [45]
19.31 [16]	39.7 [16]	13.7 [85]	14.23 [85]
19.37 [16]	40.27 [68]	13.20 [53]	16.7 [73], [75]
20.13 [17], [61]	41.18 [51]	13.21 [71]	16.18 [72]
20.18 [16]	44.13 [69]	14.14 [85]	16.33 [69]
20.21 [72]	44.15 [48]	17.10 [53]	16.36 [72]
21.29 [61]	47.7 [55]	18.10 [71]	16.43 [74]
22.5 [15]	47.13 [52]	21.6 [82]	18.11 [79]
23.29 [56]	48.15 [44]	21.12 [53]	22.18 [83]
24.14 [64]	49.2 [64]	22.2 [84]	23.5 [85]
	50.1 [77]	22.4 [71]	29.2 [84]
ISAIA	50.2 [70]	22.14 [53]	33.25 [75]
	51.2 [55], [70]	23.15 [62]	36.4 [85]
2.15 [67]	51.5 [85]	24.1 [85]	37.3 [44]
3.2 [46], [48]	53.4 [52]	25.29 [79]	37.7 [45]
3.8 [50]	53.7 [55]	26.6 [46]	30.22 [43]
3.17 [80]	53.11 [55]	26.24 [53]	38.7 [62]
8.7 [69]	57.1 [44]	27.3 [45]	39.3 [67]
9.2 [72]	57.19 [52]	28.13 [54]	39.9 [55]
9.3 [56]	59.19 [68]	29.7 [53]	39.28 [83]
10.13 [44], [48]	60.21 [52]	29.11 [80]	40.4 [43], [76], [85]
10.16 [45]	63.15 [85]	30.16 [50], [73]	43.26 [71], [72], [84]
10.17 [45]		31.39 [72]	45.10 [83]
10.33 [50]	JEREMIA	32.4 [53]	46.6 [85]
11.3 [72]		32.8 [75]	46.19 [54]
11.10 [47]	1.5 [51]	32.9 [75]	47.8 [61]
15.2 [85]	2.3 [61]	32.19 [54]	47.22 [76], [77]
18.2 [53]	2.9 [49]	32.29 [69]	48.16 [8], [22]
18.7 [53]	2.17 [57], [74]	32.35 [61]	48.21 [61]
18.13 [65]	2.18 [74]	32.41 [45]	
19.4 [69]	2.27 [53]	33.11 [74]	
19.20 [48]	2.33 [51], [71]	34.2 [80]	HOSEA
22.18 [53]	3.4 [51], [60]	38.22 [67]	1.2 [43]
24.16 [45]	3.5 [60]	39.12 [8]	2.6 [70]
25.6 [51]	3.7 [51]	40.1 [52]	4.6 [54], [73]
26.20 [61], [68], [72]	4.5 [50]	44.8 [46], [85]	5.13 [75]
27.4 [85]	4.30 [51], [53]	48.21 [54]	12.10 [54]

AMOS	88.10 [83]	LAMENTATIONS	11.39 [13]
4.12 [62]	89.11 [75]		14.1 [15]
8.12 [62]	89.29 [72]	3.35 [59]	14.10 [15]
	95.5 [24]	3.53 [59]	14.15 [12]
	99.6 [57]		15.1 [59]
MICAH	105.22 [78]	ECCLESIASTES	17.9 [23]
	106.8 [67]		17.16 [67]
1.4 [75]	107.35 [59]	1.7 [59]	18.3 [10]
1.15 [61]	109.18 [85]	3.3 [75]	18.10 [15], [61]
4.3 [74]	112.10 [62]	4.3 [59]	19.10 [15]
6.5 [80]	119.42 [62]	6.10 [60]	20.7 [12]
	119.99 [63]	10.3 [60]	21.13 [13]
NAHUM	119.101 [75]	11.3 [57]	21.23 [13]
	119.147 [60]		25.4 [58]
1.3 [71]	119.161 [60]	ESTHER	25.28 [58]
HABAKKUK	132.7 [62]	1.5 [59]	
	136.1 [55]	2.3 [57]	2 CHRONICLES
1.5 [75]	137.6 [59]	3.13 [55]	
1.16 [75]	139.23 [62]	4.7 [60]	4.2 [13]
3.19 [66]	140.13 [72]	8.7 [60]	6.17 [13]
	144.2 [83]		6.25 [76]
ZECHARIA	145.8 [71]	DANIEL	6.38 [13]
			7.22 [14]
8.20 [54]		2.10 [58]	8.4 [14]
9.1 [47], [56]	PROVERBS	10.12 [62]	9.4 [14]
		12.4 [62]	10.3 [14]
	1.3 [59]		10.7 [14]
MALACHI	1.8 [59]		10.12 [14]
	4.15 [83]	EZRA	11.1 [14]
1.5 [75]	8.35 [60]		12.2 [14]
3.19 [95], [97]	10.4 [61], [73]	9.12 [57]	13.14 [60]
3.22 [95], [96], [97]	15.14 [71]	10.8 [64]	18.8 [15]
3.23 [95], [96]	17.17 [64]	10.44 [57]	18.12 [14]
	22.8 [61]		18.15 [59]
PSALMS	23.5 [81]	NEHEMIA	18.33 [15]
	27.10 [71]		21.5 [14]
11.2 [67]	28.16 [60]	7.4 [56]	22.2 [28]
16.10 [71]	30.21 [60]	9.17 [60]	22.10 [14]
18.30 [76]			22.11 [14]
24.4 [81]	JOB		23.1 [14]
35.20 [60]		1 CHRONICLES	23.9 [14]
39.11 [75]	5.18 [71]		23.14 [14]
42.9 [61]	9.8 [85]	9.40 [57]	23.17 [14]
51.10 [75]	15.17 [84]	11.2 [12]	25.1 [14]
60.4 [62]	21.4 [75]	11.11 [12]	25.17 [15]
64.5 [57]	40.13 [67]	11.12 [12], [13]	25.22 [14]
68.27 [25]	42.2 [72]	11.15 [13]	26.21 [16]
72.7 [59]		11.17 [13]	29.28 [60]
76.12 [67]		11.18 [13]	33.13 [23]
78.17 [60]	RUTH	11.20 [13], [15]	34.10 [15]
78.28 [62], [67]		11.22 [13]	34.22 [61]
78.43 [76]	2.11 [8]	11.23 [13]	
78.50 [59]	2.14 [58]	11.31 [58]	
	3.12 [21]	11.37 [15]	

PLATES

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

115
115

על אבחתהו דילמא אירג

ואשכח את ארעא בחובבא

ואמחינך גמיר

הנה אנכי שלח לך

ותק

סבוכ פסוקא דסיפרא דין אמו

פסקות דסיפרא ח תשמו יסכו משפט

וישמי חוק שנות יכרי ואפתי

ונשבת מבד מאפרים חצי נביא

נשתלם זה ספר נביאים תרעומא ודא

על ידי ודחבר יהודה ווטר ספרא

בשנת דא תתסו ליצירה

ובתתלח לחורבן בית הבחירה

שייבנה בימינו במהרה

ויוביע ללמוד בחס ולמד בלי פשע

ותקיים כי הכתוב לא ימוש ספר השנה

הזה מפך והצית ס יוסכ וליה למען

תשמור לעשות ככל הכתוב בו כי

או תצליח את דרכך

ואו תסביל

כי הנה היום בא בער כתנור
והיו כל ודים וכל עשרי שעה קש ודח
אתם היום הבא אמר יהוה צבאות אשר
לא יעוב להם שרש וענת אריותא
אתי בער כתנורא ויהיו כל דשיותא
עברי היטאה חלשין בקטא חלחוק
יתחון ויפא דאמי אמר ין צבאות דלא
ישבך יחון בר ובר בר ודחה לבסירא
שמי שמש צדקה וצדקה בכנפיה
ויצאתם ופשתם כעלי מדק ותרו
לכו דחלי שמי שימש אהלו ואסתר
בכנפיה ותפקח ותילון בעת
ריבא ועשותם רשעים כי יהוה אפר
תחת כפות רגליכם ביום אשר אנני
עשה אמר יהוה צבאות ותרו ופון
רשיעין ארי יהוה קיטמא תחות פוסת
דחליכם ביום אדאנא עביר צכ ין צבא

וכרו תורת משה עברי אשר צוית
אתו בחרב על כלי שדאל חקיס
ומשפטים אידברו אוריתא דמסח
עברי ופקידות ותינה בחרב על כל
ישראל קיימין ודיצין הנה אנכי
שלח לכם את אליה הנביא לפני בא
יום יהוה הגדול והנורא הא אנא
שלח לכו ית אליה נביא קדם מית
ומא דעתיד למית מן קדם מרבא
ודחילא ודחילא לב אבות על בנים
ולב בנים על אבות פן אכוא ודחית
את הארץ חר

ותיב לב אבהו על בנים ולב בניה

הַגִּדְלִים הָהֵם : וְלֹא תִתֶּן יְהוָה לָכֶם לֵב לִדְעַת וְעֵינַיִם לִרְאוֹת
וְאָזְנוֹת לִשְׁמֹעַ עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה : וְאֹלֶךְ אֶתְכֶם אֶרֶץ בְּעֵים שָׁנָה בְּמִדְבָּר
לֹא בָלוּ שְׁלֹמֹתֵיכֶם מֵעַלֵיכֶם וְנַעֲלֶךְ לֹא בִלְתֶּה מֵעַל הַגִּלְד : לֶחֶם
לֹא אֲכַלְתֶּם וַיֵּין וְשִׁכָר לֹא שָׁתִיתֶם לְמַעַן תִּדְרְעוּ בְּיָמֵי יְהוָה
אֱלֹהֵיכֶם : וְתָבֹאוּ אֶל-הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה וַיֵּצֵא סִיחֹן מֶלֶךְ הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל וְעֹג
מֶלֶךְ הַבָּשָׁן לִקְרֹאתָנוּ לְמַלְחָמָה וְנָכֶם : וְנִקַּח אֶת-אֶרֶצָם וְגִתָּהּ
לְנַחֲלָה לְדָאוּבִי וְלִגְדִי וְלַחֲצִי שְׁבֵט יִשְׂרָאֵל : וְשִׁמְרֹתֶם אֶת-
דְּבָרֵי הַבְּרִית הַזֹּאת וַעֲשִׂיתֶם אֹתָם לְמַעַן תִּשְׁכִּילוּ אֶת כָּל-אֲשֶׁר
תַּעֲשׂוּן :

[illegible]